or "TSS" was entered for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about January of 2008 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET code was entered correctly. The failure to submit accurate DMRs prior to January 28, 2009 is in violation of Administrative Order WE-AO-07-0030, La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs after January 28, 2009 in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0081981 (Part I, Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

9. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES Permit LA0081981. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed the DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. The Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by an authorized representative is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0081981 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

10. The Respondent's monthly average and weekly average flow rates exceeded the 85,000 gallons per day maximum estimated flow rate authorized by LPDES Permit LA0081981. Specifically, the monthly average and weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum estimated flow rate of 85,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
July 01, 2010 through July 31, 2010	88,200 gpd Weekly Average
August 01 through August 31, 2010	103,700 gpd Weekly Average
September 01, 2010 through September 30, 2010	103,700 gpd Weekly Average
October 01, 2010 through October 31, 2010	139,200 gpd Weekly Average
November 01 through November 30, 2010	139,200 gpd Weekly Average
November 01 through November 30, 2010	94,700 gpd Monthly Average
December 01, 2010 through December 31, 2010	139,200 gpd Weekly Average
December 01, 2010 through December 31, 2010	94,400 gpd Monthly Average
January 01, 2011 through January 31, 2011	103,700 gpd Weekly Average

February 01, 2011 through February 28, 2011	103,700 gpd Weekly Average
March 01, 2011 through March 31, 2011	139,200 gpd Weekly Average

XVI.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Quiet Oaks Subdivision sanitary wastewater treatment facility located at the 100th Block Bayou Blue Bypass Road, Gray, Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana. On or about January 27, 2006, the Department received a Notice of Intent for coverage under an LPDES General Permit from the Respondent. On or about September 13, 2006, the Department granted coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG570000 to the Respondent. The Respondent was specifically assigned permit number LAG570354. On or about March 14, 2009, LPDES General Permit LAG570000 expired and on or about May 01, 2009, the reissued LPDES General Permit LAG570000 became effective. On or about June 03, 2009, the Department received a Notice of Intent for reissuance of coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG570000 from the Respondent and the Department renewed coverage under LPDES LAG570354 on or about June 12, 2009 to the Respondent. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG570354, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater into St. Louis Bayou, waters of the state.

A. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent was discharging without a permit from March 15, 2009 until June 12, 2009. LPDES permit LAG570354 expired on March 14, 2009. Discharge Monitoring Reports submitted beginning March of 2009 through June of 2009 revealed the Respondent continued to discharge to waters of the state after the expiration of LPDES permit LAG570354. Operating without a LPDES permit or other authority to discharge wastes and/or other substances into waters of the state is a violation of La. R.S. 30:2075. The Respondent's failure to submit a renewal application prior to the expiration date of the permit is a violation of LPDES permit LAG570354 (Part II, Section C and Part III, Sections A.2 and A.5.b), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.B.

2. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG570354. These effluent exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMITATION	REPORTED VALUE
April 2007	001	TSS. Monthly Average	15 mg/L	21 mg/L
March 2010	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	16 mg/L *
December 2010	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	18 mg/L

*Failure to submit Non-compliance report

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570354 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section A.2) La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

3. The Respondent failed to submit Non-compliance Reports (NCR) in a timely manner. Specifically, on the date(s) indicated by an asterisk (*) in the above table, the Respondent did not submit a Non-compliance Report at the time the DMRs are required to be submitted. The Respondent's failure to submit Non-compliance Reports is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570354 (Part III, Section A.2 and D.7), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.7.

4. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" was entered for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about April of 2007 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570354 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

5. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG570354. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570354 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

6. The Respondent's weekly average flow rate exceeded the less than 100,000 gallons per day maximum expected flow rate authorized by LPDES General Permit LAG570354. Specifically, the weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum expected flow rate of less than 100,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
October 01, 2008 through October 31, 2008	137,000 gpd Weekly Average
May 01, 2009 through May 31, 2009	103,700 gpd Weekly Average
May 01,2010 through May 31, 2010	125,200 gpd Weekly Average
May 01, 2009 through May 31, 2009	107,100 gpd Weekly Average
June 01, 2010 through June 30, 2010	145,600 gpd Weekly Average
August 01, 2010 through August 31, 2010	182,500 gpd Weekly Average
November 01, 2010 through November 30, 2010	102,900 gpd Weekly Average
January 01, 2011 through January 31, 2011	120,000 gpd Weekly Average

XVII.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Rebecca Plantation sanitary wastewater treatment facility located at the intersection of U.S. Hwy. 90 and LA Hwy. 311, Houma, Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana. On or about November 14, 2008, the Department received the request for the transfer of ownership and LPDES General Permit LAG541668 from the Respondent. The transfer was requested on or about November 01, 2008. The Respondent is presently operating under LPDES General Permit LAG541668 that was issued to the previous owner/operator on or about September 11, 2008. LPDES General Permit LAG541668 is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2013. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG541668, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater into an unnamed drainage ditch, thence into Ouiski Bayou, thence into Black Bayou.

A. On or about February 13, 2009, an inspection was conducted by the Department in response to an incident (Incident ID#: 112502) that revealed the Respondent did cause or allow the unauthorized discharge of untreated sanitary wastewater from a location not specified in LPDES General Permit LAG541668. Specifically, during the period beginning on or about January 12, 2009 and ending on or about February 02, 2009, the Respondent did cause or allow the unauthorized release of approximately 39,375 gallons of untreated sanitary wastewater into a ditch thence into the surface of the ground in a wooded area near the intersection of US Hwy. 90 and LA Hwy. 311. The unauthorized release of untreated sanitary wastewater occurred when a contractor failed to complete the installation of a sanitary wastewater service line to the main force line of a wastewater treatment plant. The Respondent's failure to prevent the unauthorized

discharge of untreated sanitary wastewater from a location not specified in LPDES General Permit LAG541212 is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541668 (Part I, Schedule A, Part II, Section I; and Part III, Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A)(3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, LAC 33:IX.501.D. However, according to the Department's Incident Report 112502, on or about February 03, 2009, the installation of the sanitary wastewater service line to the main force line was completed, the spill was contained in a small depression and remediated properly, and lime was utilized to disinfect the area. Therefore, on or about March 17, 2009, the Department issued a "Notice of Corrected Deficiency" to the Respondent.

B. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG541668. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONIROTING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
January-March 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	97 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	97 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	97 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	97 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	>6000 col/100mL
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	>6000 col/100mL
October-December 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	57 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	57 mg/L
January-March 2010	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	96.8 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	96.8 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	>6000 col/100mL
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	>6000 col/100mL
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	85.3 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	85.3 mg/L
April-June 2010	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	68.5 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	90 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	47 mg/L

	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	219.5 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	282 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	157 mg/L
July-September 2010	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	140 mg/L *
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	140 mg/L *

*Failure to submit Non-compliance report

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES permit LAG541668 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section A.2) La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

2. The Respondent failed to submit Non-compliance Reports (NCR) in a timely manner. Specifically, on the date(s) indicated by an asterisk (*) in the above Table, the Respondent did not submit a Non-compliance Report at the time the DMRs are required to be submitted. The Respondent's failure to submit Non-compliance Reports is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541668 (Part III, Section A.2 and D.7), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.7.

3. The Respondent failed to measure flow in the manner required by LPDES General Permit LAG541668. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, the "Flow Sample Type" was indicated as "Grab" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about January of 2009 and ending on or about December of 2010. The "Flow Sample Type" required by the permit is "Measure". Each of the Respondent's failure to properly measure the flow is in violation of LPDES permit LAG541668 (Part I, Section B, Schedule A and Part III, Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

4. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about October of 2008 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to report accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541668 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

5. The Respondent failed to monitor and report all the required parameters indicated in the permit. Specifically, for the period beginning on or about October of 2008 and ending

on or about the ending date of the Department's file review, the Respondent failed to report effluent values for "Oil & Grease" as required by the permit. The facility's original permit application indicated that some facilities within the subdivision would be operating cafeterias for their employees and that grease traps would be installed at all the facilities with food service. Therefore, as per the Effluent Limitations requirements in Schedule A of the permit monitoring and reporting for "Oil & Grease" is required. The Respondent's failure to monitor and report all the required parameters indicated in the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541668 (Part I, Schedule A), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.2701.J.1 and LAC 33:501.A.

6. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG541668. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541668 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

7. The Respondent's weekly average flow rate exceeded the less than 25,000 gallons per day maximum expected flow rate authorized by LPDES General Permit LAG541668. Specifically, the weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum expected flow rate of less than 25,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
October 01, 2009 through December 31, 2009	49,900 gpd Weekly Average
January 01, 2010 through March 31, 2010	42,400 gpd Weekly Average
April 01, 2010 through June 30, 2010	108,400 gpd Weekly Average
July 01, 2010 through September 30, 2010	86,400 gpd Weekly Average
October 01, 2010 through December 31, 2010	34,800 gpd Weekly Average
January 01, 2011 through March 31, 2011	26,700 gpd Weekly Average

XVIII.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Seraphim Estates sanitary wastewater treatment facility located three (3) miles South of Napoleonville, Assumption Parish, Louisiana. On or about January 05,

2005, the Department reissued coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG540112 to the Respondent. LPDES General Permit General Permit LAG540112 expired on or about February 29, 2008 but was administratively continued. On or about August 29, 2008, the Department renewed coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG540112 to the Respondent. LPDES General Permit LAG540112 is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2013. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG540112, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater through local drainage, thence into the Cancienne Canal, thence into Lake Verret, waters of the state.

A. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG540112. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
April-June 2007	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	800 col/100mL
		Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	800 col/100mL
April-June 2009		Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	3700 col/100mL
		Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	3700 col/100mL
July-September 2009		pH, Instantaneous Maximum	9 SU	9.3 SU
October-December 2009		TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	118 mg/L
January-March 2010		BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	37.2 mg/L
		pH, Instantaneous Maximum	9 SU	9.5 SU
		TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	157 mg/L
		TSS, Weekly Average	45 mg/L	157 mg/L

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG540112 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section A.2) La. R.S..30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

2. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about October of 2008 and ending on or about March

of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. Additionally, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, incorrect effluent limitations for TSS were reported during the period beginning on or about April of 2007 through on or about the ending date of the Department's file review of March 31, 2011. The facility is an oxidation pond system; therefore, as indicated in Schedule A of the permit effluent limitations requirements for TSS for pond systems, the "Monthly Average" value is 90 mg/L and the "Weekly Average" value is 135 mg/L. The Respondent utilized the "Monthly Average" and "Weekly Average" limits for facilities other than oxidation pond systems. This might have contributed to unnecessary permit effluent exceedance and excursion reporting for TSS on the DMRs. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG540112 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

3. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG540112. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG540112 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

4. The Respondent's weekly average flow rate exceeded the less than 25,000 gallons per day maximum expected flow rate authorized by LPDES General Permit LAG540112. Specifically, the weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum expected flow rate of less than 25,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
April 01, 2007 through June, 30, 2007	26,400 gpd Weekly Average
January 01, 2008 through March 31, 2008	47,900 gpd Weekly Average
July 01, 2008 through September 30, 2008	25,500 gpd Weekly Average
October 01, 2009 through December 31, 2009	50,000 gpd Weekly Average

January 01, 2010 through March 31, 2010	64,400 gpd Weekly Average
July 01, 2010 through September 30, 2010	33,700 gpd Weekly Average

XIX.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the St. Agnes Subdivision sanitary wastewater treatment facility located at the end of St. Agnes Drive, Bourg, Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana. On or about June 17, 2003, the Department received a "Notice of Intent" for renewal of coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG560065 by the Respondent; and, the renewal was granted by the Department on or about November 21, 2003. On or about July 31, 2008, LPDES General Permit LAG560065 expired but was administratively continued; and, on or about October 16, 2009, the Department renewed coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG560065 to the Respondent. LPDES General Permit LAG560065 is scheduled to expire on May 31, 2014. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG560065, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater into Bayou LaCache, thence into Bush Canal, thence into Bayou Terrebonne, waters of the state.

A. On or about July 15-16, 2009, a joint inspection was conducted by EPA and the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent did not properly operate and maintain the facility. Specifically, on the date of the inspection, the lagoons were overgrown with vegetation, there were low spots along the discharge side of the embankment that had less than one inch of freeboard, and a levee wall had been damaged by a burrowing animal. Additionally, minor erosion had occurred around the levee. The Respondent's failure to properly operate and maintain all systems of treatment of a permitted facility is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560065 (Part II, Section N.5 and Part III, Sections A.2 and B.3), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.E.

2. The Respondent failed to notify the Department of the change in the effluent discharge location. The discharge was relocated from the end of the secondary cell, as described in the "Notice of Intent" and submitted on or about June 17, 2003, to near the center of the longest part of the secondary cell. The Respondent's failure to submit notification prior to changes in outfall location is in violation of LPDES permit LAG560065 (Part III, Section A.2 and Part III, Section C.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

B. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG560065. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
April 2010	001	Fecal coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 mL	220 col/100 mL
	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	29.0 mg/L
May 2010	001	Fecal coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 mL	800 col/100 mL
	001	Fecal coliform, weekly Average	400 col/100 mL	800 col/100 mL

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560065 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

2. The Respondent failed to properly sample the facility's effluent. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent for June of 2009 and September of 2010, no samples were collected; however, a flow was reported. The Respondent's failure to properly sample the effluent is a violation of LPDES permit LAG560065 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Sections A.2, and C.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

3. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about October of 2008 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560065 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

4. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG560065. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative

and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560065 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

5. The Respondent's weekly average flow rate exceeded the less than 50,000 gallons per day maximum expected flow rate authorized by LPDES General Permit LAG560065. Specifically, the weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum expected flow rate of less than 50,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
July 01, 2008 through July 31, 2008	70,400 gpd Weekly Average
August 01, 2008 through August 31, 2008	96,400 gpd Weekly Average
September 01, 2009 through September 30, 2009	57,600 gpd Weekly Average
March 01, 2011 through March 31, 2011	60,000 gpd Weekly Average

XX.

The Respondent owns and/or operates The Oaks at Belle River sanitary wastewater treatment facility located on Floyd Drive, Pierre Part, Assumption Parish, Louisiana. On or about March 31, 2004, the Department granted coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG560000 to the Respondent. The Respondent was specifically assigned permit number LAG560203. On or about July 31, 2008, LPDES General Permit LAG560203 expired; however, it was administratively continued. On or about July 31, 2009, the Department renewed coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG560203 to the Respondent. LPDES General Permit LAG560203 is scheduled to expire on May 31, 2014. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG560203, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater into local drainage, thence into Belle River, waters of the state.

A. On or about October 2, 2008 an inspection was conducted by the Department and on or about July 14-16, 2009, a joint inspection was conducted by EPA and the Department that revealed the Respondent did not properly operate and maintain the facility. Specifically, during the inspection of October 02, 2008, it was noted that there were no records of sludge wasting in the past year. Additionally, during the inspection conducted on or about July 14-16, 2009, it was noted that the discharge pipe was under weeds and sediment, and there was not a point to collect a representative sample or to properly measure flow and it was noted that two of the four return

activated sludge airlift pumps were clogged, and there was a hole in the bottom of the weir trough. The Respondent's failure to properly operate and maintain all systems of treatment of a permitted facility is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560203 (Part II, Section N.5 and Part III, Sections A.2 and B.3), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.E.

B. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review conducted by the Department revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent failed to properly sample the facility's effluent and to make provisions during the installation of the facility for obtaining a proper sample. Specifically, on the DMR submitted by the Respondent for November 2007, no samples were collected; however, a flow was reported. Additionally, on DMRs and Non-compliance Reports submitted by the Respondent for the period of October 2009 through June 2010 indicated "No Discharge" during sampling attempts because the discharge pipe was under water. The Respondent's failure to properly sample the effluent and to make provisions during the installation of the facility for obtaining a proper sample is in violation of LPDES permit LAG560203 (Part I, Schedule A, Part II, Section N.3, and Part III, Sections A.2 and C.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

2. The Respondent failed to submit "Non-compliance Reports (NCRs)" to the Department. Specifically, NCRs were not submitted for November 2007. The Respondent's failure to submit NCRs is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560203 (Part III, Sections A.2 and D.7), La R.S. 30:2076(A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.7.

3. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about October of 2008 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560203 (Part I, Schedule A and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

4. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG560203. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning

October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560203 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

XXI.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Wellington Ridge sanitary wastewater treatment facility located on the corner of Ridge Road and Stoneburg Drive, Duson, Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. On or about February 10, 2006, the Department granted the necessary "Name/Operator/Ownership" change to the Respondent. The Respondent continued operation of the facility under LPDES General Permit LAG570347 that had been granted to the previous owner/operator on or about October 12, 2005 by the Department. On or about March 14, 2009, LPDES General Permit LAG570347 expired. On or about May 22, 2009, the Department renewed coverage under the renewed LPDES General Permit LAG570347 to the Respondent. LAG570347 is scheduled to expire on April 30, 2014. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG570347, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater into an unnamed ditch, thence into Indian Bayou, thence into Bayou Queue de Tortue, waters of the state.

A. On or about July 15, 2008, a joint inspection was conducted by EPA and LDEQ that revealed the Respondent did not properly operate and maintain the facility. Specifically, the clarifier weir on the new train was observed to be unlevel and the grass needed to be mowed inside the fence line around the treatment units. The Respondent's failure to properly operate and maintain all systems of treatment of a permitted facility is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570347 (Part II, Section N.5 and Part III, Sections A.2 and B.3), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.E.

B. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent was discharging without a permit from March 15, 2009 until May 22, 2009. LPDES permit LAG570347 expired on March 14, 2009. Discharge Monitoring Reports submitted beginning March of 2009 through May of 2009 revealed the Respondent continued to discharge to waters of the state after the expiration of LPDES

permit LAG570347. Operating without a LPDES permit or other authority to discharge wastes and/or other substances into waters of the state is a violation of La. R.S. 30:2075. The Respondent's failure to submit a renewal application prior to the expiration date of the permit is a violation of LPDES permit LAG570347 (Part II, Section C and Part III, Sections A.2 and A.5.b), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.B.

2. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG570347. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
May 2007	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	20 mg/L
August 2007	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	1428 col/100mL
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	1428 col/100mL
February 2008	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	600 col/100mL
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	600 col/100mL
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	64 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	23 mg/L	64 mg/L
March 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	16 mg/L
April 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	57 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	23 mg/L	57 mg/L
July 2008	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	360 col/100mL
November 2008	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	400 mg/L
December 2008	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	380 mg/L
January 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	352 mg/L
February 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	406 mg/L
June 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	428 mg/L
July 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	380 mg/L
August 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	408 mg/L
October 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	318 mg/L
November 2009	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	<600 col/100mL
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	<600 col/100mL
January 2010	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100mL	440 col/100mL
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100mL	440 col/100mL

	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	286 mg/L
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	18 mg/L
February 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	384 mg/L
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	22 mg/L
June 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	440 mg/L
August 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	322 mg/L
September 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	376 mg/L
October 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	426 mg/L.
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	21 mg/L

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570347 (Part I, Schedules A, I, and J and Part III, Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

3. The Respondent failed to properly sample the facility's effluent. Specifically, on the DMRs submitted by the Respondent for November of 2007 and May of 2010, no samples were collected; however, a flow was reported. The Respondent's failure to properly sample the effluent is a violation of LPDES permit LAG570347 (Part I, Schedules A, I, and J and Part III, Sections A.2, and C.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

4. The Respondent failed to submit "Non-compliance Reports (NCRs)" to the Department. Specifically, NCRs were not submitted for November of 2007 and May of 2010. The Respondent's failure to submit NCRs is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570347 (Part III, Sections A.2 and D.7), La R.S. 30:2076(A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.7.

5. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, On DMRs submitted by the Respondent during each of the monitoring periods beginning on November of 2008 through February of 2009 and June of 2009, the Respondent improperly indicated "Report" for the "Permit Requirement" for "Turbidity" and for "Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)". However, on or about October 12, 2008, the permit requirements for "Turbidity" and "TDS" were the actual limits of 150 NTU Weekly Average and 260 mg/L Weekly Average, respectively. Also, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about April of 2007 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. Additionally, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or

about April of 2007 and ending on or about March of 2011, "Residue, Total Filterable" instead of "Total Dissolved Solids" or "TDS" was entered. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570354 (Part I, Schedules A, I, and J and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

6. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG570354. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG570354 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

XXII.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Westbrook Subdivision sanitary wastewater treatment facility located off of LA Hwy. 342 on Golden Grain Road, Duson, Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. On or about July 11, 2005, the Department received a "Notice of Intent" from the Respondent for coverage under an LPDES General Permit for the discharge of treated sanitary wastewater. On or about August 24, 2005, the Department granted coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG560000 to the Respondent. The Respondent was specifically assigned permit number LAG560245. LPDES General Permit LAG560245 expired on July 31, 2008, but was administratively continued. On or about July 31, 2009, the Department renewed coverage under LPDES General Permit LAG560245 to the Respondent. LPDES General Permit LAG560245 is scheduled to expire on May 31, 2014. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES General Permit LAG560245, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater into an unnamed ditch, thence into Indian Bayou, waters of the state.

A. On or about April 22, 2009, a joint inspection was conducted by EPA and LDEQ that revealed that the Respondent had the following violations:

1. The Respondent did cause or allow the discharge of inadequately treated sanitary wastewater with visible deposits of sewage sludge into an unnamed drainage ditch,

waters of the state. The Respondent's failure to prevent the unauthorized discharge of inadequately treated wastewater with visible deposits of sewage sludge to waters of the state is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560245 (Part I, Section A.1, Part I, Section B Schedule A, and Part III, Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.1. The improper surface disposal of sewage sludge into an unnamed drainage ditch is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560245 (Part I, Section B Schedule A, Part II, Section G, and Part III, Section B.6), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3) and LA 33:IX.7301.G.2.

2. The Respondent did not properly operate and maintain the facility. Specifically, on the date of the inspection it was noted that the solids collection box from the aeration basin had a 2" thick cover of floating solids. According to the Respondent's representative, sludge had not been removed from the plant and the bottom of the chlorinator tube had disintegrated and needed to be replaced so that the tube can properly hold the chlorine tablets while providing the gaps for contact with the effluent flow through the box. The Respondent's failure to properly operate and maintain all systems of treatment of a permitted facility is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560245 (Part II, Section N.5 and Part III, Sections A.2 and B.3), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.E.

3. The Respondent failed to follow proper sampling and monitoring procedures. Specifically, it was noted during the inspection that, on the chain of custody forms filled out by the Respondent's sampling personnel, the fecal coliform collection times occurred between 8:00 a.m. and 11:20 a.m. instead of during peak loads. Copies of laboratory results submitted by the Respondent on or about June 04, 2009 in response to a request made during the inspection conducted on or about April 22, 2009, indicated that fecal coliform samples were collected prior to 9:30 AM for the months of February, April, May, August, October, November, and December of 2008. The Respondent's failure to follow proper sampling and monitoring procedures is in violation of LPDES Permit LAG560245 (Part II, Section N.1 and .4 and Part III, Sections A.2 and C.5), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.2701.E, and LAC 33:IX.2701.J.4.

B. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG560245. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
September of 2007	001	TSS, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	21 mg/L
May of 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	39.00 mg/L*
	001	TSS, weekly Average	30 mg/L	39.00 mg/L*
July of 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	352 mg/L*
September of 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	296 mg/L
December of 2009	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	276 mg/L
February of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	380 mg/L
April of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	328 mg/L
May of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	358 mg/L
June of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	318 mg/L
July of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	278 mg/L*
September of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	338 mg/L*
October of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	370 mg/L*
December of 2010	001	TDS, Daily Maximum	260 mg/L	342 mg/L*

*Failure to submit Noncompliance report

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of the LPDES General Permit LAG560245 (Part I, Schedules A, I, and J and Part III, Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

2. The Respondent failed to submit Non-compliance Reports (NCR) in a timely manner. Specifically, on the date(s) indicated by an asterisk (*) in the above table, the Respondent did not submit a Non-compliance Report at the time the Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR) are required to be submitted. The Respondent's failure to submit Non-

compliance Reports is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG LAG560245 (Part III, Section A.2 and D.7), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.7.

3. The Respondent failed to properly sample the facility's effluent. Specifically, on the DMRs submitted by the Respondent for August of 2009 and October of 2009, no samples were collected; however, a flow was reported. The Respondent's failure to properly sample the effluent is a violation of LPDES permit LAG560245 (Part I, Schedules A, I, and J and Part III, Sections A.2, and C.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

4. The Respondent failed to submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent during the period of July of 2007, the Respondent reported a value of "0" for BOD_5 for the "Monthly Average" and the "Weekly Average". Also, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about April of 2007 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. Additionally, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about April of 2007 and ending on or about March of 2011, "Residue, Total Filterable" instead of "Total Dissolved Solids" or "TDS" was entered. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560245 (Part I, Schedules A, I, and J and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

5. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG560245. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG560245 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

6. The Respondent's weekly average flow rate exceeded the less than 50,000 gallons per day maximum expected flow rate authorized by LPDES General Permit LAG560245. Specifically, the weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum expected flow rate of less than 50,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
January 01, 2009 through January 31, 2009	55,600 gpd Weekly Average
March 01, 2010 through March 31, 2010	66,600 gpd Weekly Average

XXIII.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Willow Creek Subdivision sanitary wastewater treatment facility located off of Blanco Street, Milton, Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. The Respondent was granted coverage under Louisiana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (LPDES) General Permit LAG540000 on November 14, 2008, and was specifically assigned permit number LAG541129. LPDES permit will expire on June 30, 2013. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES permit LAG541129, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater to an unnamed coulee, thence into Bayou Parc Pardu, waters of the state.

A. On or about November 06-07, 2007 a joint inspection was conducted by EPA and the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent failed to follow proper sampling and monitoring procedures. Specifically, the Respondent's sampling and testing laboratory was not following the proper sample preservation procedures for fecal coliform. The chain of custody forms showed residual chlorine was present in the samples collected. The chain of custody forms did not show a dechlorinating agent was added to any of the fecal coliform samples collected. Analytical results would be invalid because of the continuation of bactericidal action during transit. Additionally, the Respondent's laboratory records did not reference the analytical techniques or method utilized for the pH analysis. In addition, no times were recorded for the pH analysis to show if the samples were analyzed within the 15-minute grab sample time frame. Each of the Respondent's failure to follow proper sampling and monitoring procedures is in violation of LPDES Permit LAG541129 (Part II, Section N.1 and N.4 and Part III, Sections A.2 and C.5), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.2701.E, and LAC 33:IX.2701.J.4.

2. The Respondent failed to properly sample the facility's effluent. Specifically, the

Respondent failed to collect a quarterly sample for the monitoring period of April to June 2007, and October to December 2007. The Respondent's failure to properly sample the facility's effluent is a violation of LPDES permit LAG541129 (Part I, page 4 of 16, and Part III, Sections A.2, and C.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), LAC 33:IX.501.A, and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.

3. The Respondent did not properly operate and maintain the facility. Specifically, on the date of the inspection only one of the two lift station pumps was functioning in the onsite lift station. Additionally, the Respondent failed to provide adequate operating staff. The permit requires that the Respondent provide an adequate operating staff, which is duly qualified to carry out the proper operations, maintenance, and other functions necessary to ensure compliance with the conditions of the permit. According to the District Supervisor, at the time of the inspection, there existed 130 plants under the District Supervisor's direct supervision. The District Supervisor had 3 certified operators and 7 other employees that were undergoing training. This gave a ratio of 10 to 12 plants for each operator. The Respondent's failure to properly operate and maintain all systems of treatment of a permitted facility is in violation of LPDES permit LAG541129 (Part III, Sections A.2 and B.3), La. R. S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.E.

4. The Respondent failed to properly submit accurate DMRs. Specifically, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, a flow of 0.00053 MGD and 0.0144 MGD was reported for the 2nd and 3rd quarter monitoring periods respectively; but, in the comment field, "No Flow" was reported for the same monitoring periods. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541129 (Part I, Section B, Schedule A and Part III, Section A.2 and D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

B. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES General Permit LAG541129. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
January-March 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	57 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	57 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	TNTC
	001	Fecal Colifom, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	TNTC
	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	45 mg/L
July-September 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	62 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	62 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	220 col/100 ml
October-December 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	84 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	84 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	520 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Colifom, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	520 col/100 ml
	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	33 mg/L
January-March 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	43 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	35 mg/L
July-September 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	57.50 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	97 mg/L
	001	Fecal Colifom, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	601 col/100 ml
October-December 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	36 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Colifom, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml

April-June 2010	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	54 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	54 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
July-September 2010	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	54 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	54 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Colifom, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
October-December 2010	001	TSS, Monthly Average	30 mg/L	67 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	40 mg/L	67 mg/L

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541129 (Part I, Section B, Schedule A and Part III Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

2. The Respondent failed to properly submit accurate DMRs. On DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about April of 2007 and ending on or about March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541129 (Part I, Section B, Schedule A and Part III, Section D.4), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

3. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LAG541129. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly

authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES General Permit LAG541129 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

4. The Respondent's weekly average flow rate exceeded the less than 25,000 gallons per day maximum expected flow rate authorized by LPDES General Permit LAG541129. Specifically, the weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum expected flow rate of less than 25,000 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
January 01, 2008 through March 31, 2008	57,400 gpd Weekly Average
July 01, 2008 through September 30, 2008	30,900 gpd Weekly Average
October 01, 2008 through December 31, 2008	32,400 gpd Weekly Average
January 01, 2010 through March 31, 2010	34,800 gpd Weekly Average
April 01, 2010 through June 30, 2010	28,000 gpd Weekly Average
January 01, 2011 through March 31, 2011	84,100 gpd Weekly Average

XXIV.

The Respondent owns and/or operates the Windy Meadows sanitary wastewater treatment facility, serving the Windy Meadows and Country Village Subdivisions, located at 109 Windfern Drive, Youngsville, Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. The Respondent was issued a Louisiana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (LPDES) Individual Permit LA0122343 on December 28, 2006, with an effective date of February 1, 2007. LPDES permit is scheduled to expire on January 31, 2012. Under the terms and conditions of LPDES Permit LA0122343, the Respondent is authorized to discharge treated sanitary wastewater to an unnamed ditch, thence into Anselm Coulee, thence into the Vermillion River, waters of the state.

A. On or about July 07, 2011, as a response to an incident notification by the Respondent, an inspection was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent did cause or allow the unauthorized discharge of 900 gallons of untreated sanitary wastewater with visible signs of solids and/or sewage sludge from a location not specified in LPDES Permit LA0122343 into an unnamed ditch, waters of the state. The Respondent's failure to prevent the unauthorized discharge of untreated sanitary wastewater with visible signs of solids and/or sewage sludge into an unnamed ditch, waters of the state is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part I, Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements and Part III Section A.2 and Section B.6), La.

R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.1. The Respondent's failure to properly dispose of solids and/orsewage sludge into an unnamed drainage ditch is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part I, Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements and Part III and Section B.6), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3) and LA 33:IX.7301.G.1.

2. The Respondent did not properly operate and maintain the facility. Specifically, on the date of the inspection, two leaks were observed at the treatment facility. The first leak was found coming out of a pipe along the side of the re-aeration/stabilization portion of the treatment facility and the second leak was observed along the bottom of the treatment unit at a rusted area. The Respondents failure to properly operate and maintain the facility is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part III, Section A.2 and B.3), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.E.

3. The Respondent failed to properly mitigate an unauthorized discharge of inadequately treated sanitary wastewater with visible deposits of solids and sewage sludge. Specifically, on the date of the inspection it was noted that, although lime was added to the area of the unauthorized discharge, the solids and sewage sludge were not removed. The Respondents failure to properly mitigate is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part II, Sections A.2 and B.2); La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

B. On or about July 12, 2011 an inspection, as a response to an incident notification by the Respondent, was conducted by the Department that revealed the Respondent did cause or allow the overflow of 600 gallons of inadequately treated sanitary wastewater from a sewer manhole across a resident's property at 106 Windchimes Drive, Youngsville, Lafayette Parish, into the street, and eventually down the storm drain. The Respondent's failure to prevent the overflow of inadequately treated wastewater is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part I, Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements and Part III Section A.2), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.A.1.

C. On or about March 31, 2011, a file review was conducted by the Department that revealed the following violations:

1. The Respondent exceeded the effluent limitations contained in LPDES Permit LA0122343. These exceedances, as reported by the Respondent on DMRs, are summarized below:

MONITORING PERIOD	OUTFALL	PARAMETER	PERMIT LIMIT	REPORTED VALUE
December 2007	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	35 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Weekly Average	15 mg/L	35 mg/L
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	40 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	23 mg/L	40 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	19.30 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	19.30 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	2.05 mg/L
January 2008	001	BOD_5, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	37.5 mg/L
	001	BOD_5, Weekly Average	30 mg/L	48 mg/L
	001	TSS, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	59 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	30 mg/L	97 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	17.5 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	20 mg/L	24.7 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	1.52 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	1,673.4 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	20,001 col/100 ml
February 2008	001	DO	5 mg/L	2.42 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	477.5 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	600 col/100 ml
April 2008	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.49 mg/L
May 2008	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	17.3 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	21.3 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.9 mg/L

June 2008	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	12.6 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	18.2 mg/L
July 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	44 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	23 mg/L	79 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	10.65 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	12.1 mg/L
August 2008	001	TSS, Monthly Average	15 mg/L	18 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	23 mg/L	27 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	8.46 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	16.7 mg/L
September 2008	001	TSS, Weekly Average	23 mg/L	24 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	9.46 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	18.2 mg/L
October 2008	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	10.9 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	13.3 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.8 mg/L
November 2008	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	5.83 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	11.1 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.83 mg/L
December 2008	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	510 col/100 ml
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.95 mg/L
January 2009	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	12.75 mg/L
February 2009	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	18.6 mg/L

	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	20 mg/L	21.9 mg/L
March 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	51 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	30 mg/L	90 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	21.9 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	20 mg/L	22.2 mg/L
April 2009	001	TSS, Monthly Average	20 mg/L	33 mg/L
	001	TSS, Weekly Average	30 mg/L	33 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	15.1 mg/L
May 2009	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	16.2 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	16.2 mg/L
June 2009	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	10.9 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	10.9 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.2 mg/L
July 2009	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	601 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	601 col/100 ml
August 2009	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	24.1 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	24.1 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.75 mg/L
September 2009	001	Ammonia Monthly Average	5 mg/L	7.1 mg/L
October 2009	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.15 mg/L
December 2009	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	<600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	<600 col/100 ml
January 2010	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.71 mg/L
March 2010	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	601 col/100 ml

April 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	10 mg/L	15.65 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	20 mg/L	21.9 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	600 col/100 ml
May 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	18.25 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	21.9 mg/L
June 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	23.9 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	24.4 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	600 col/100 ml
July 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	11.65 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	16.7 mg/L
	001	DO	5 mg/L	4.86 mg/L
August 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	16.9 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	24.1 mg/L
September 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	18.2 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	18.2 mg/L
October 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	11.7 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	11.7 mg/L
	001	Fecal Coliform, Monthly Average	200 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
	001	Fecal Coliform, Weekly Average	400 col/100 ml	>600 col/100 ml
November 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	8.85 mg/L

December 2010	001	Ammonia, Monthly Average	5 mg/L	17.2 mg/L
	001	Ammonia, Weekly Average	10 mg/L	17.2 mg/L

Each exceedance of permit effluent limitations indicated in the above table is in violation of LPDES permit LA0122343 (Part I, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements, Page 2 of 2), La. R.S. 30:2076(A) (3) and LAC 33:IX.501.A.

2. The Respondent did cause or allow the unauthorized discharge of untreated sanitary wastewater from a location not specified in LPDES General Permit LA0122343. Specifically, on or about October 11, 2010, the Respondent did cause or allow the unauthorized discharge of an unspecified volume of untreated wastewater onto the ground at 109 Windfern Drive as a result of a broken pump at a lift station. The Respondent's failure to prevent the unauthorized discharge of untreated sanitary wastewater from a location not specified in LPDES General Permit LAG540939 is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part I, Final Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Requirements, Page 2 of 2), La. R.S. 30:2076(A)(1)(a) and LAC 33:IX.501.D.

3. The Respondent submitted inaccurate DMRs. Specifically, The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is in violation of on DMRs submitted by the Respondent for December of 2007 and for all the monitoring periods for the years of 2008, 2009, and 2010, the wrong permit number was entered. In addition, on the DMR submitted by the Respondent for December of 2007, BOD_5 was reported in place of $CBOD_5$. Additionally, on DMRs submitted by the Respondent, "Residue, Total Non-filterable" instead of "Total Suspended Solids" or "TSS" for each of the monitoring periods beginning on or about January of 2008 through March of 2011. However, the STORET Code was entered correctly. The Respondent's failure to submit accurate DMRs in accordance with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the permit is a violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part II, Section 11, and Part III, Section D.4), La R.S. 30:2076(A)(3) and LAC 33:IX.2701.L.4.a.

4. The Respondent failed to have a duly authorized representative sign the DMRs in accordance with LPDES General Permit LA0122343. Specifically, Mr. Ted Zelasko

signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2009 through September of 2010 instead of a duly authorized representative and Ms. Tammy Prieskop signed DMRs submitted to the Department for each of the monitoring periods beginning October of 2010 through March of 2011 instead of a duly authorized representative. Each of the Respondent's failure to submit DMRs signed by a duly authorized representative is in violation of LPDES Permit LA0122343 (Part III, Subsection D.10.b (1)), La. R.S. 30:2076 (A) (3), and LAC 33:IX.2503.B.

5. The Respondent's monthly average and weekly average flow rates exceeded the 71,700 gallons per day maximum estimated flow rate authorized by LPDES Permit LA0081981. Specifically, the monthly average and weekly average flow rates which exceeded the maximum estimated flow rate of 71,700 gallons per day were reported by the Respondent on the DMR dates indicated in the table below:

MONITORING PERIOD	REPORTED FLOW
February 01, 2008 through February 29, 2008	73,400 gpd Weekly Average
March 01, 2008 through March 31, 2008	74,500 gpd Weekly Average
September 01, 2009 through September 31, 2009	75,800 gpd Weekly Average

COMPLIANCE ORDER

Based on the foregoing, the Respondent is **hereby ordered**:

I.

To immediately cease, upon receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, any and all unauthorized discharges to waters of the state.

II.

To take, immediately upon receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, any and all steps necessary to meet and maintain compliance with the Water Quality Regulations and LPDES permits **LAG560175, LAG532083, LAG540172, LAG541357, LAG560244, LAG540939, LAG541182, LA0122254, LA0122017, LAG541444, LAG570171, LAG570483, LAG570237, LA0081981, LAG570354, LAG541668, LAG540112, LAG560065, LAG560203, LAG570347, LAG560245, LAG541129, and LA0122343**. This shall include, but not be limited to, correcting all the violations cited in Paragraphs II through XXIV of the "Findings of Fact" section of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, and complying with the permit effluent limitations, monitoring and reporting and all other conditions and requirements of each permit indicated within this paragraph. In the event the Respondent believes that complete compliance is not physically possible within thirty (30) days, the Respondent shall submit to the Enforcement Division, within thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER,** a comprehensive plan for the expeditious elimination and prevention of such non-compliance. Such plan shall provide for specific corrective actions to be taken and shall include a critical path schedule for the achievement of compliance within the shortest time possible.

III.

To prepare and submit to the Enforcement Division within thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, a determination of the number of full-time employees, along with the associated calculations, needed to properly operate and maintain each facility listed in Part I of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**.

IV.

To submit to the Enforcement Division, within thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, all records of flow, documentation on how flow is measured, recorded and calculated and a written explanation of the flow values that exceeded the maximum expected flow for each facility listed in Parts II, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XII, XIII, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XXII, and XXIII

and the maximum estimated flow for each facility listed in Parts XV and XXIV of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**.

V.

To submit to the Enforcement Division within eight (8) months after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, a completed "Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist" (attached) for each facility listed in Part I of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**.

VI.

To prepare and implement, within thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER,** a "Sludge Management Plan" for each facility listed in Part I of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**. The "Sludge Management Plan" shall describe, in detail, what procedures will be taken to ensure that sludge is removed when necessary and used or disposed of in accordance with the proper regulations, that adequate appropriate equipment for sludge handling is available, and the proper personnel needed for sludge handling are available. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, a description of operating and maintenance procedures for making determinations for the needed and timely removal of the sludge from each facility, preparation process management plan, odor management plan, regulatory interfaces, worker health and safety, housekeeping and nuisance management, and a description of disposal methods. In addition, the plan shall describe the personnel and equipment available and administration of the operations and maintenance manual to ensure compliance.

VII.

To submit to the Enforcement Division, within thirty (30) days after receipt of the **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, a copy of the "Sludge Management Plan" developed for each facility listed in Part I of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**.

VIII.

To submit to the Water Permits Division, at least one hundred and eighty (180) days prior to January 01, 2013 or the scheduled date required by the *Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge and Biosolids* (LAC 33:IX.Subpart 3.Chapter 73), the necessary application(s) for the appropriate Sewage Sludge and Biosolids Use or Disposal Permit for the facilities listed in Part I of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**. The necessary application(s) shall be submitted to:

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Environmental Services
Water Permits Division
Post Office Box 4313
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-4313

IX.

To take, immediately upon receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, any and all steps necessary to submit complete and accurate DMRs for each facility listed in Part I of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**.

X.

To submit to the Enforcement Division, within thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER,** a plan to address all the operations and maintenance violations indicated for each facility listed in Parts III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XII, XIV, XV, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, and XXIV of the "Findings of Fact" of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, instructions for each employee on the proper operation and maintenance of each facility from headworks (or influent for pond systems) to effluent discharge, proper inspection schedules for each facility and for each associated collection system (including lift/pump stations and connections to individual homes/businesses, etc.), facility grounds maintenance (including levees for pond systems), proper effluent sampling (collection, preparedness, holding times, etc.), and worker health and safety.

XI.

To take, immediately upon receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, the necessary steps to assure that an appropriate sampling location is available for the sampling of the facility's effluent at any and all times of the year, as required by the permit, for the Eloi Plantation (LAG541444), Lakes at Dutchtown Subdivision (LAG570237), The Oaks at Belle River (LAG560203), Wellington Ridge (LAG570347), and Westbrook Subdivision (LAG560245) facilities.

XII.

To initiate, immediately upon receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, a six (6) month study at the Grand Marnier Subdivision (LAG570171) sanitary wastewater treatment facility to determine the cause(s) of the pH violations indicated in Paragraph XII.B.2 of the "Findings of Fact" section of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**. The study shall include, but not be limited to, a survey of all contributors to the collection system and the listing of any sewage sludge and/or wastewater hauler disposing either into the collection system or at any point directly into the sanitary wastewater treatment facility, the final

conclusion of the cause(s) of the pH violations, and a comprehensive plan for the expeditious elimination and prevention of the pH violations.

XIII.

To submit to the Enforcement Division within thirty (30) days after conclusion of the pH violations study at the Grand Marnier Subdivision (LAG570171) sanitary wastewater treatment facility required to be performed in Part XII above, the result of the study, along with the list of all contributors to the collection system and the sanitary wastewater treatment facility and the comprehensive plan for the expeditious elimination and prevention of the pH violations.

XIV.

To submit to the Enforcement Division, within thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**, a written report that includes a detailed description of the circumstances surrounding the cited violations and actions taken or to be taken to achieve compliance with the Order Portion of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**. This report and all other reports or information required to be submitted to the Enforcement Division by this **COMPLIANCE ORDER** shall be submitted to:

Office of Environmental Compliance
Post Office Box 4312
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-4312
Attn: J. Kilren Vidrine
Re: Enforcement Tracking No.: WE-CN-10-01311
Agency Interest Nos.: 42031, 135247, 19949, 124057, 126816, 19832, 113866, 137752, 128670, 139246, 42293, 41762, 103849, 22148, 128702, 158605, 43003, 33050, 84826, 122537, 122560, 113893, 139481

THE RESPONDENT SHALL FURTHER BE ON NOTICE THAT:

I.

The Respondent has a right to an adjudicatory hearing on a disputed issue of material fact or of law arising from this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**. This right may be exercised by filing a written request with the Secretary no later than thirty (30) days after receipt of this **COMPLIANCE ORDER**.

II.

The request for an adjudicatory hearing shall specify the provisions of the **COMPLIANCE ORDER** on which the hearing is requested and shall briefly describe the basis for the request. This request should reference the Enforcement Tracking Number and Agency Interest Number, which are located in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of this document and should be directed to the following:

Department of Environmental Quality
Office of the Secretary
Post Office Box 4302
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-4302
Attn: Hearings Clerk, Legal Division
Re: Enforcement Tracking No.: WE-CN-10-01311
Agency Interest Nos.: 42031, 135247, 19949, 124057, 126816, 19832, 113866, 137752, 128670, 139246, 42293, 41762, 103849, 22148, 128702, 158605, 43003, 33050, 84826, 122537, 122560, 113893, 139481

III.

Upon the Respondent's timely filing a request for a hearing, a hearing on the disputed issue of material fact or of law regarding this **COMPLIANCE ORDER** may be scheduled by the Secretary of the Department. The hearing shall be governed by the Act, the Administrative Procedure Act (La. R.S. 49:950, et seq.), and the Department's Rules of Procedure. The Department may amend or supplement this **COMPLIANCE ORDER** prior to the hearing, after providing sufficient notice and an opportunity for the preparation of a defense for the hearing.

IV.

This **COMPLIANCE ORDER** shall become a final enforcement action unless the request for hearing is timely filed. Failure to timely request a hearing constitutes a waiver of the Respondent's right to a hearing on a disputed issue of material fact or of law under Section 2050.4 of the Act for the violation(s) described herein.

V.

The Respondent's failure to request a hearing or to file an appeal or the Respondent's withdrawal of a request for hearing on this **COMPLIANCE ORDER** shall not preclude the Respondent from contesting the findings of facts in any subsequent penalty action addressing the same violation(s), although the Respondent is estopped from objecting to this **COMPLIANCE ORDER** becoming a permanent part of its compliance history.

VI.

Civil penalties of not more than thirty-two thousand five hundred dollars ($32,500) may be assessed for each day of violation. The Respondent's failure or refusal to comply with this **COMPLIANCE ORDER** and the provisions herein will subject the Respondent to possible enforcement procedures under La. R.S. 30:2025, which could result in the assessment of a civil penalty in an amount of not more than fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for each day of continued violation or noncompliance.

VII.

For each violation described herein, the Department reserves the right to seek civil penalties in any manner allowed by law, and nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the right to seek such penalties.

NOTICE OF POTENTIAL PENALTY

I.

Pursuant to La. R.S. 30:2050.3(B), you are hereby notified that the issuance of a penalty assessment is being considered for the violation(s) described herein. Written comments may be filed regarding the violation(s) and the contemplated penalty. If you elect to submit comments, it is requested that they be submitted within ten (10) days of receipt of this notice.

II.

Prior to the issuance of additional appropriate enforcement action(s), you may request a meeting with the Department to present any mitigating circumstances concerning the violation(s). If you would like to have such a meeting, please contact J. Kilren Vidrine at (225) 219-3507 within ten (10) days of receipt of this **NOTICE OF POTENTIAL PENALTY.**

III.

The Department is required by La. R.S. 30:2025(E) (3) (a) to consider the gross revenues of the Respondent and the monetary benefits of noncompliance to determine whether a penalty will be assessed and the amount of such penalty. Please forward the Respondent's most current annual gross revenue statement along with a statement of the monetary benefits of noncompliance for the cited violation(s) to the above named contact person within ten (10) days of receipt of this **NOTICE OF POTENTIAL PENALTY.** Include with your statement of monetary benefits the method(s) you utilized to arrive at the sum. If you assert that no monetary benefits have been gained, you are to fully justify that statement.

IV.

This **CONSOLIDATED COMPLIANCE ORDER & NOTICE OF POTENTIAL PENALTY** is effective upon receipt.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 07 day of December, 2011.

Cheryl Sonnier Nolan
Assistant Secretary
Office of Environmental Compliance

Copies of a request for a hearing and/or related correspondence should be sent to:

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Environmental Compliance
Enforcement Division
P.O. Box 4312
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4312
Attention: J. Kilren Vidrine

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

Collection System Description

Question	Response/Documentation
Population of service area/number of residents/commercial connections	
Number of pump stations	
Feet (or miles) of sewer	
Age of system (e.g., 30% over 30 years, 20% over 50 years, etc.)	

Continuing Sewer Assessment Plan

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the collection system experience problems related to I/I? How do these problems manifest themselves? (Manhole overflows, basement flooding, structure, SSOs)	
How does the owner or operator prioritize investigation, repairs, and rehabilitation related to I/I?	
What methods are considered to remedy hydraulic deficiencies?	
Does the plan include a schedule for investigative activities?	
Is the plan regularly updated?	

Organizational Structure

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there an organized chart available that shows the overall personnel structure for the collection system, including adequate operation and maintenance staff?	

Training

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there training in the following areas: • Routine line maintenance • Pipe repair • Pump station operations	
Describe the training requirements and documentation for collection system staff	

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

Communication and Customer Service

Question	Response/Documentation
What methods are used to notify the public of major construction or maintenance work? • Door hangers • Newspaper • Fliers • Signs • Other • None	
What are the common complaints received? How are complaint records maintained (i.e., computerized)? Is this information used as the basis for other activities such as routine preventative maintenance?	

SSO Notification Program

Question	Response/Documentation
What are the notification procedures to the regulatory agency dependent on the size or location of overflow events?	
Is there a standard form for recording and reporting overflow events? Does it include location, type, receiving water, estimated volume, remediation, and cause (acute or chronic)?	

Legal Authority

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the collection system receive flow from satellite communities?	
Are there any known problems with the satellite user collection system hydraulic flow, WW concentration, ordinances?	
Who is responsible for enforcement and response?	

Budgeting

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there an annual operating budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP)?	

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

Compliance

Question	Response/Documentation
What are the programs to address Fats, Oil, and Grease (FOG) in the collection system and grease at the WWTP? How are these programs addressed?	

Water Quality Monitoring

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there monitoring of water quality following SSOs?	

Hydrogen Sulfide Monitoring and Control

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the owner or operator have any hydrogen sulfide issues? If so, how are these issues addressed?	

Emergency Preparedness and Response

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there an emergency response plan including equipment and processes? Is there a contingency plan?	
How often is the plan reviewed and updated? What was the date it was last updated?	

Modeling

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the owner or operator have a current hydraulic model of the collection system including pump stations? What model is used?	

Engineering – System Mapping and As-Built Plans (Record Drawings)

Question	Response/Documentation
Is a mapping/inventory system used? If so, is there a systematic numbering and identification method/system established to identify sewer system manholes, sewer lines, and other items (pump stations, etc.)?	

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

Engineering – Capacity

Question	Response/Documentation
What procedures are used in determining whether the capacity of existing gravity sewer system, pump stations, and force mains are adequate for new connections?	

Engineering – Construction

Question	Response/Documentation
Are there any procedures for conducting construction inspections and testing programs?	

Pump Stations – Operation

Question	Response/Documentation
How many pump stations are in the system? How many have backup power sources?	

Pump Stations – Inspection and Monitoring

Question	Response/Documentation
How often are pump stations inspected, and if a SCADA system is used, what parameters are monitored?	
How are lift stations monitored?	

Pump Stations – Emergencies

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there sufficient redundancy of equipment in all pump stations? What equipment is redundant?	
How is loss of power at a station dealt with (i.e., on-site electrical generators, alternate power source, and portable electric generator)?	

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

Sewer Cleaning

Question	Response/Documentation
What percent of the sewer lines are cleaned on a system wide basis, e.g., at the rate of once every seven or twelve years or at a rate of between 8% and 14% per year?	
Is there a program to identify sewer line segments that have chronic problems and should be cleaned on a more frequent schedule?	
Has the number of stoppages increased, decreased, or stayed the same over the past 5 years?	

Sewer Cleaning – Chemical Cleaning and Root Removal

Question	Response/Documentation
What results are achieved through the use of chemical cleaners?	
Are there any chemical additives used for grease and/or root removal?	

Parts Inventory

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the owner or operator have a central location for the storage of spare parts? Are critical spare parts identified and readily available?	

Performance Indicators

Question	Response/Documentation
How many sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) have occurred in the last 5 years? How many less than 1,000 gallons?	
Does the owner or operator document and report all SSOs regardless of size?	
Does the owner or operator document basement backups?	
Are there areas that experience basement or street flooding?	
How many SSOs have reached "waters of the US?" Is there a record?	

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

Performance Indicators

Question	Response/Documentation
Approximately, what percent of SSOs discharge where from each of the following in the last 5 years: manholes, pump stations, main and trunk sewers, lateral and branch sewers, structural bypasses?	
What is the average annual influent BOD?	
What is the ratio of peak wet weather flow to average dry weather flow?	
Approximately, what percent of SSO discharge were caused by the following in the last 5 years: debris buildup, collapsed pipe, root intrusion, capacity limitations, excessive infiltration and inflow, FOG, vandalism?	
What percent of SSOs were released to: soil; surface water; basements; paved areas; coastal, ocean, or beach areas; rivers, lakes, or streams?	
For surface water releases, what percent are to surface waters that could affect: contact recreation, shellfish growing areas, drinking water sources?	
Are pipes with chronic SSOs being monitored for sufficient capacity and/or structural condition?	
Are any structurally deteriorating pipelines being monitored for renewal or replacement?	

Sewer System Capacity Evaluation (SSES): Internal TV Inspection

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the owner or operator use internal TV inspection? If so, please describe the program.	

SSES: Survey and Rehabilitation (General)

Question	Response/Documentation
Have SSESs been performed in the past? If so, is documentation available? Are there any recommendations for improved performance in the future?	

Sanitary Sewer Overflow Inspection Checklist

SSES: Flow Monitoring

Question	Response/Documentation
Does the owner or operator have a flow monitoring program? If so, please describe.	
Does the owner or operator have a comprehensive assessment and planning program?	

SSES: Smoke Testing and Dyed Water Flooding

Question	Response/Documentation
Is there a smoke testing program to identify sources of infiltration and inflow into the system including private service laterals and illegal connections? If so, please describe.	
What follow-up occurs as a result of positive results for smoke or dye testing?	

SSES: Manhole Inspection

Question	Response/Documentation
How are priorities established for rehabilitation, replacement, inspection, and repair of manholes?	

Rehabilitation: Mainline Sewers

Question	Response/Documentation
What techniques have been used in the past, and what is currently being used by the owner or operator for main line repairs?	