



SUSANA MARTINEZ
Governor

JOHN A. SANCHEZ
Lieutenant Governor

NEW MEXICO
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Surface Water Quality Bureau

Harold Runnels Building, N2050
1190 South St. Francis Drive (87505)
P.O. Box 5469, Santa Fe, NM 87502-5469
Phone (505) 827-0187 Fax (505) 827-0160
www.nmenv.state.nm.us



DAVE MARTIN
Secretary

BUTCH TONGATE
Deputy Secretary

JAMES H. DAVIS, Ph.D.
Director
Resource Protection Division

CERTIFIED MAIL – RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

December 11, 2012

Honorable Rudy Jaramillo, Mayor
City of Belen
100 South Main
Belen, NM 87002

Re: Major Municipal, SIC 4952, NPDES Compliance Evaluation Inspection, Belen WWTP, Belen, New Mexico, NM0020150, November 29, 2012

Dear Mayor Jaramillo,

Enclosed, please find a copy of the report for the referenced inspection that the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) conducted at your facility on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). This inspection report will be sent to the USEPA in Dallas, for their review. These inspections are used by USEPA to determine compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program in accordance with requirements of the Clean Water Act.

Problems noted during this inspection are discussed in the Further Explanations section of this inspection report. You are encouraged to review the inspection report, and required to correct any problems noted during the inspection, and to modify your operational and/or administrative procedures, as appropriate. Further, you are encouraged to notify, in writing, both USEPA (Diana McDonald, USEPA (6EN-WC), 1445 Ross Ave., Dallas, TX 75202) and NMED (at the above address) regarding modifications and compliance schedules.

Thank you for the cooperation and assistance of Mr. Leroy Otero during this inspection. If you have any questions about this inspection report, please contact me at sarah.holcomb@state.nm.us or 505-222-9587.

Sincerely,

/s/ Sarah Holcomb

Sarah Holcomb
Surface Water Quality Bureau

Cc: Rashida Bowlin, USEPA (6EN-AS) by email
Hannah Branning, USEPA (6EN-AS) by email
Darlene Whitten-Hill, USEPA (6EN-AS) by email
Carol Peters-Wagnon, USEPA (6EN-WM) by email
Diana McDonald, USEPA (6EN-WM) by email
Larry Giglio, USEPA (6EN-PP) by email
Bill Chavez, NMED District 1 Manager, by email



Form Approved
OMB No. 2040-0003
Approval Expires 7-31-85

NPDES Compliance Inspection Report

Section A: National Data System Coding

Transaction Code	NPDES	yr/mo/day	Inspec. Type	Inspector	Fac Type
1 N 2 5 3 N M 0 0 2 0 1 5 0 11 12 1 2 1 1 2 9 17 18 C 19 S 20 2					
Remarks					
M A J O R W W T P					
Inspection Work Days	Facility Evaluation Rating	BI	QA	Reserved	
67 69	70 3	71 N	72 N	73	74 75 80

Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected (For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number) Belen WWTP, Valencia County, New Mexico: From I-25, take Exit 195 on US 85 south. Travel about 5 miles on US 85, then turn east on Vivian Road. Travel about 0.3 miles, turn south on Conservancy Road. Road leads directly to WWTP.	Entry Time /Date 0845 / 11-29-2012	Permit Effective Date 9-1-2009
	Exit Time/Date 1130 / 11-29-2012	Permit Expiration Date 8-31-2014
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s) Mr. Leroy Otero, Chief Operator (505) 966-2581 Mr. Greg Morgan, Operator	Other Facility Data SIC 4952	
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number Mayor Rudy Jaramillo (505) 966-2733 100 South Main Street, Belen, NM 87001	Contacted Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	N. 34° 38.527' W. -106° 46.614'

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection (S = Satisfactory, M = Marginal, U = Unsatisfactory, N = Not Evaluated)

S	Permit	S	Flow Measurement	S	Operations & Maintenance	N	CSO/SSO
M	Records/Reports	S	Self-Monitoring Program	S	Sludge Handling/Disposal	N	Pollution Prevention
S	Facility Site Review	N	Compliance Schedules	N	Pretreatment	N	Multimedia
U	Effluent/Receiving Waters	M	Laboratory	N	Storm Water	N	Other:

Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

1. Please see Further Explanations for details.

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) Sarah Holcomb /s/ Sarah Holcomb	Agency/Office/Telephone/Fax 505-222-9587	Date 12-11-2012
Signature of Management QA Reviewer Bruce Yurdin /s/ Bruce Yurdin	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers 505-827-2795	Date 12-11-2012

SECTION A – PERMIT VERIFICATION

PERMIT SATISFACTORILY ADDRESSES OBSERVATIONS S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED NO)
 DETAILS:

1. CORRECT NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF PERMITTEE Y N NA

2. NOTIFICATION GIVEN TO EPA/STATE OF NEW DIFFERENT OR INCREASED DISCHARGES Y N NA

3. NUMBER AND LOCATION OF DISCHARGE POINTS AS DESCRIBED IN PERMIT Y N NA

4. ALL DISCHARGES ARE PERMITTED Y N NA

SECTION B – RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING EVALUATION

RECORDS AND REPORTS MAINTAINED AS REQUIRED BY PERMIT. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED YES)
 DETAILS:

1. ANALYTICAL RESULTS CONSISTENT WITH DATA REPORTED ON DMRs. Y N NA

2. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES DATA ADEQUATE AND INCLUDE. S M U NA

a) DATES, TIME(S) AND LOCATION(S) OF SAMPLING Y N NA

b) NAME OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMING SAMPLING Y N NA

c) ANALYTICAL METHODS AND TECHNIQUES. Y N NA

d) RESULTS OF ANALYSES AND CALIBRATIONS. Y N NA

e) DATES AND TIMES OF ANALYSES. Y N NA

f) NAME OF PERSON(S) PERFORMING ANALYSES. Y N NA

3. LABORATORY EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION AND MAINTENANCE RECORDS ADEQUATE. S M U NA

4. PLANT RECORDS INCLUDE SCHEDULES, DATES OF EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR. S M U NA

5. EFFLUENT LOADINGS CALCULATED USING DAILY EFFLUENT FLOW AND DAILY ANALYTICAL DATA. Y N NA

SECTION C – OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

TREATMENT FACILITY PROPERLY OPERATED AND MAINTAINED. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED NO)
 DETAILS:

1. TREATMENT UNITS PROPERLY OPERATED. S M U NA

2. TREATMENT UNITS PROPERLY MAINTAINED. S M U NA

3. STANDBY POWER OR OTHER EQUIVALENT PROVIDED. S M U NA

4. ADEQUATE ALARM SYSTEM FOR POWER OR EQUIPMENT FAILURES AVAILABLE. S M U NA

5. ALL NEEDED TREATMENT UNITS IN SERVICE S M U NA

6. ADEQUATE NUMBER OF QUALIFIED OPERATORS PROVIDED. S M U NA

7. SPARE PARTS AND SUPPLIES INVENTORY MAINTAINED. S M U NA

8. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE MANUAL AVAILABLE. Y N NA

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES AND SCHEDULES ESTABLISHED. Y N NA

PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY TREATMENT CONTROL ESTABLISHED. Y N NA

SECTION C – OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE (CONT'D)

9. HAVE BYPASSES/OVERFLOWS OCCURRED AT THE PLANT OR IN THE COLLECTION SYSTEM IN THE LAST YEAR? Y N NA
 IF SO, HAS THE REGULATORY AGENCY BEEN NOTIFIED? Y N NA
 HAS CORRECTIVE ACTION BEEN TAKEN TO PREVENT ADDITIONAL BYPASSES/OVERFLOWS? Y N NA

10. HAVE ANY HYDRAULIC OVERLOADS OCCURRED AT THE TREATMENT PLANT? Y N NA
 IF SO, DID PERMIT VIOLATIONS OCCUR AS A RESULT? Y N NA

SECTION D – SELF-MONITORING

PERMITTEE SELF-MONITORING MEETS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED NO).
 DETAILS:

1. SAMPLES TAKEN AT SITE(S) SPECIFIED IN PERMIT. Y N NA

2. LOCATIONS ADEQUATE FOR REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES. Y N NA

3. FLOW PROPORTIONED SAMPLES OBTAINED WHEN REQUIRED BY PERMIT. Y N NA

4. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES COMPLETED ON PARAMETERS SPECIFIED IN PERMIT. Y N NA

5. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES PERFORMED AT FREQUENCY SPECIFIED IN PERMIT. Y N NA

6. SAMPLE COLLECTION PROCEDURES ADEQUATE Y N NA

a) SAMPLES REFRIGERATED DURING COMPOSITING. Y N NA

b) PROPER PRESERVATION TECHNIQUES USED. Y N NA

c) CONTAINERS AND SAMPLE HOLDING TIMES CONFORM TO 40 CFR 136.3. Y N NA

7. IF MONITORING AND ANALYSES ARE PERFORMED MORE OFTEN THAN REQUIRED BY PERMIT, ARE THE RESULTS REPORTED IN PERMITTEE'S SELF-MONITORING REPORT? Y N NA

SECTION E – FLOW MEASUREMENT

PERMITTEE FLOW MEASUREMENT MEETS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED YES).
 DETAILS: STAFF GAGES WILL NEED TO BE REPLACED SOON – MARKINGS ARE WORN DOWN.

1. PRIMARY FLOW MEASUREMENT DEVICE PROPERLY INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED. Y N NA
 TYPE OF DEVICE 12" Parshall Flume with Drexelbrook totalizer

2. FLOW MEASURED AT EACH OUTFALL AS REQUIRED. Y N NA

3. SECONDARY INSTRUMENTS (TOTALIZERS, RECORDERS, ETC.) PROPERLY OPERATED AND MAINTAINED. Y N NA

4. CALIBRATION FREQUENCY ADEQUATE. Y N NA
 RECORDS MAINTAINED OF CALIBRATION PROCEDURES. Y N NA
 CALIBRATION CHECKS DONE TO ASSURE CONTINUED COMPLIANCE. Y N NA

5. FLOW ENTERING DEVICE WELL DISTRIBUTED ACROSS THE CHANNEL AND FREE OF TURBULENCE. Y N NA

6. HEAD MEASURED AT PROPER LOCATION. Y N NA

7. FLOW MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT ADEQUATE TO HANDLE EXPECTED RANGE OF FLOW RATES. Y N NA

SECTION F – LABORATORY

PERMITTEE LABORATORY PROCEDURES MEET PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED YES).
 DETAILS: TSS MUST BE DONE ACCORDING TO APPROVED PROCEDURES IN 40 CFR 136.3.

1. EPA APPROVED ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES USED (40 CFR 136.3 FOR LIQUIDS, 503.8(b) FOR SLUDGES) Y N NA

SECTION F – LABORATORY (CONT'D)

2. IF ALTERNATIVE ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES ARE USED, PROPER APPROVAL HAS BEEN OBTAINED Y N NA
3. SATISFACTORY CALIBRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF INSTRUMENTS AND EQUIPMENT. S M U NA
4. QUALITY CONTROL PROCEDURES ADEQUATE. S M U NA
5. DUPLICATE SAMPLES ARE ANALYZED. 100 % OF THE TIME. Y N NA
6. SPIKED SAMPLES ARE ANALYZED. % OF THE TIME. Y N NA
7. COMMERCIAL LABORATORY USED. Y N NA

LAB NAME BIO-AQUATIC TESTING NM SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY DIVISION

LAB ADDRESS 2501 MAYES ROAD #100, CARROLLTON, TX 75006 1101 CAMINO DE SALUD NE, ABO, NM 87102

PARAMETERS PERFORMED BIOMONITORING SLUDGE ANALYSIS

SECTION G – EFFLUENT/RECEIVING WATERS OBSERVATIONS. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED YES).

OUTFALL NO.	OIL SHEEN	GREASE	TURBIDITY	VISIBLE FOAM	FLOAT SOL.	COLOR	OTHER
001	NONE OBSERVED	NONE OBSERVED	SLIGHTLY	YES	NONE OBSERVED	NONE OBSERVED	

RECEIVING WATER OBSERVATIONS Foam observed at outfall occurs seasonally in the spring and fall, according to permittee's representative.

SECTION H – SLUDGE DISPOSAL

SLUDGE DISPOSAL MEETS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS. S M U NA (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED NO).

DETAILS:

1. SLUDGE MANAGEMENT ADEQUATE TO MAINTAIN EFFLUENT QUALITY. S M U NA
2. SLUDGE RECORDS MAINTAINED AS REQUIRED BY 40 CFR 503. S M U NA
3. FOR LAND APPLIED SLUDGE, TYPE OF LAND APPLIED TO: composted – given away (e.g., FOREST, AGRICULTURAL, PUBLIC CONTACT SITE)

SECTION I – SAMPLING INSPECTION PROCEDURES (FURTHER EXPLANATION ATTACHED).

1. SAMPLES OBTAINED THIS INSPECTION. Y N NA
2. TYPE OF SAMPLE OBTAINED
 GRAB COMPOSITE SAMPLE METHOD FREQUENCY
3. SAMPLES PRESERVED. Y N NA
4. FLOW PROPORTIONED SAMPLES OBTAINED. Y N NA
5. SAMPLE OBTAINED FROM FACILITY'S SAMPLING DEVICE. Y N NA
6. SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVE OF VOLUME AND MATURE OF DISCHARGE. Y N NA
7. SAMPLE SPLIT WITH PERMITTEE. Y N NA
8. CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY PROCEDURES EMPLOYED. Y N NA
9. SAMPLES COLLECTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PERMIT. Y N NA

**Compliance Evaluation Inspection
Belen Wastewater Treatment Plant
NPDES Permit No. NM0020150
November 29, 2012**

Introduction

On November 29, 2012, Sarah Holcomb of the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), Surface Water Quality Bureau (SWQB) conducted a Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI) at the Belen Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The Belen WWTP has a design flow capacity of 1.2 MGD (million gallons per day) and is classified as a major municipal discharger under the Federal Clean Water Act, Section 402, of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program. It is assigned NPDES permit number NM0020150. This permit regulates the WWTP discharge to Bosque Drain, thence to the Rio Grande in segment 20.6.4.105 NMAC of the *State of New Mexico Standards for Interstate and Intrastate Surface Waters, 20.6.4 NMAC*. This segment includes the designated uses of irrigation, marginal warmwater aquatic life, livestock watering, public water supply, wildlife habitat and primary contact.

The NMED performs a certain number of CEIs for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Region VI, under the NPDES permit program, in accordance with the federal Clean Water Act. USEPA uses these inspections to determine compliance with the NPDES permit program. This inspection report is based on information provided by the permittee's representatives, observations made by the NMED inspector, and records and reports kept by the permittee and/or NMED.

Upon arrival at the WWTP at 0845 hours on November 29, 2012, the inspector met Mr. Leroy Otero, Chief Operator. During the entrance interview, the inspector showed her credentials, made introductions and explained the purpose of the inspection. A tour of the facility commenced thereafter, and the inspector also reviewed the facility's laboratory and records. An exit interview to discuss the preliminary findings of the inspection was conducted at 1115 hours on November 29, 2012 at the facility with Mr. Otero and Mr. Greg Morgan, Operator/Lab Tech.

Treatment Scheme

The Belen WWTP is an activated sludge facility. There are 19 lift stations in the collection system to bring the wastewater to the plant. Flow into the facility has recently been around 0.7-0.8 MGD. The facility does have some inflow and infiltration (I&I) issues – when it rains, the permittee's representative indicated that flow can increase by about 0.6 mgd for a couple of hours.

The flow enters the facility through the headworks, which consists of an influent lift station with a wetwell and four 15 horsepower screw pumps, which are rated for 835 gpm each. The pumps are alternated so there are two on and two off. From the headworks, the flow travels through the entrance works, including a bar screen and 12" influent Parshall flume with a Drexelbrook totalizing meter. From the entrance works, the flow travels through the grit tank. This process removes high specific gravity solids from the wastewater.

After the grit removal process, the flow enters the aeration basins. There are two aeration basins, which are normally run in parallel, but the capacity is available to run all flow through only one aeration basin if maintenance is needed. The air is provided to the aeration process through fine bubble diffusers. After aeration, the flow is sent to secondary clarifiers. There are two secondary clarifiers, each of a depth of 10 feet. RAS from the clarifiers is sent through a trough between the two aeration basins back to the beginning of the aeration basins. Once solids have settled into the secondary clarifiers, flow is then sent to parallel chlorine contact chambers for disinfection, where the water is in contact with chlorine for about 30-45 minutes. The water is dechlorinated and then discharged via a 36" rectangular weir, with another Drexelbrook totalizing meter. The effluent is discharged into the Bosque Drain, then to the Rio Grande.

Sludge

Solids removed from the process in the grit chamber are sent to the grit classifier and are then de-watered. These solids are disposed in the landfill after drying.

WAS (waste activated sludge) is drawn from the bottoms of the secondary clarifiers and pumped to the sludge thickener unit. The sludge is then thickened in this unit to about 2% solids, when it is then pumped to the aerobic digesters. Supernatant from the sludge thickener is piped back to the influent wet well and re-introduced to the aeration basins. The aerobic digesters are normally operated in series. Only one was in operation at the time of this inspection. Generally, about 45,000 gallons of sludge are wasted per day to the sludge thickener. The normal total detention time in two digesters is about 40 days.

After the sludge is digested, it is pumped to the sludge drying beds. The facility currently has four sludge drying beds. Drainage from the beds is routed back to the wet well at the main plant lift station. After the sludge is dried to approximately 50% total solids, the sludge is moved to a sludge composting pad for composting. The composting process uses static piles and windrows. After being held for 15 days at 55°C, and being turned 5 times in this period, the final sludge product is used as a soil conditioner on private property. A local farmer takes the composted sludge and applies it on a 600 acre alfalfa field. At the time of this inspection, the permittee indicated that there was some discussion of additional sludge management measures. Either new sludge beds would be installed, or a belt press was being investigated.

Further Explanations

Note: The sections are arranged according to the format of the enclosed EPA Inspection Checklist (Form 3560-3), rather than being ranked in order of importance.

Section B – Recordkeeping and Reporting Evaluation – Overall rating of Marginal

The permit requires in Part III.C.2:

Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity.

And in the EPA Region 6 Reporting Requirements Handbook, Part H.2, it states:

...Always be sure to use the flow measurement determined on the day when sampling was done.

Findings for Recordkeeping and Reporting:

The permittee was reporting BOD loading calculations derived with hourly flows instead of a totalized flow for the day. EPA has determined that proper BOD loading values are calculated using the entire day's totalized flow from the facility so that the number reported is representative of the facility's activity for the entire day. This is applicable, even if the facility is not conducting 24 hour composite sampling.

Section E – Flow Measurement Evaluation – Overall rating of Satisfactory

The permit requires in Part III.C.6:

Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. The devices shall be installed, calibrated and maintained to insure that the accuracy of the measurements is consistent with the accepted capability of that type of device. Devices selected shall be capable of measuring flows with a maximum deviation of less than 10% from true discharge rates throughout the rates of expected discharge volumes.

Findings for Flow Measurement:

The permittee's representative indicated that the flow meters are calibrated twice per year, but that occasional calibration checks between those professional calibrations are not done. It is extremely important that flow measurements from a facility are accurate because all of the loading calculations reported on the Discharge Monitoring Report are based on those flows. It is recommended that the facility perform checks of the flow measurement to ensure that the meters are reading within $\pm 10\%$ of actual flow rates.

The staff gages at both the influent and effluent were showing signs of wear at the time of this inspection. The facility was aware of this and has this on their list of items to repair.

Section F – Laboratory Evaluation – Overall rating of Marginal

The permit requires in Part III.C.5.a:

Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 CFR 136, unless other test procedures have been specified in this permit or approved by the Regional Administrator.

The permit requires in Part III.C.5.c:

An adequate analytical quality control program, including the analyses of sufficient standards, spikes and duplicate samples to insure the accuracy of all required analytical results shall be maintained by the permittee or designated commercial laboratory.

Standard Methods (20th Edition), Method 5210B states:

The DO uptake attributable to the seed added to each bottle should be between 0.6 and 1.0 mg/L, but the amount of seed added should be adjusted to from this range to that required to provide glucose-glutamic acid check results in the range of 198 ±30.5 mg/L.

Findings for Laboratory:

During review of the lab procedures, it was noted that the laboratory personnel were still utilizing the old EPA method for TSS analysis, which utilizes the “shake and pour” technique for filtering the sample. The only approved method for TSS in Part 136 as of the time of this inspection is the Standard Methods version, SM 2540D-1997. This method requires the analyst to pipette the sample into the filtering mechanism.

The permittee’s representative indicated that the facility does not run duplicate samples. It is important to the facility’s quality control program to run duplicates to ensure data credibility. The general recommendation is that duplicate samples are run 10% of the time.

During review of the permittee’s bench sheets for BOD, the inspector noted that the BOD dilution water was consistently out of range during the month of June 2011. However, it appears that changes were made to address this problem and the dilution water BOD values were consistently in range for January 2012. The seed correction factor was another item the inspector noted during review of the BOD bench sheets from this facility. Standard Methods states that the seed correction factor should be between 0.6-1.0 mg/L. Throughout both months of data checked, the seed correction factor was consistently over 1.0 mg/L until the latter part of January, when this issue appeared to be fixed.

Section G – Effluent/Receiving Waters Observations Evaluation – Overall rating of Unsatisfactory

The permit states in Part I.A Floating Solids, Visible Foam and/or Oils:

There shall be no discharge of floating solids or visible foam in other than trace amounts. There shall be no discharge of visible films of oil, globules of oil, grease or solids in or on the water, or coatings on stream banks.

Findings for Effluent/Receiving Waters Observations:

There was a large residual of foam at the outfall of the treatment plant into the irrigation drain. The permittee’s representative indicated that this is a routine occurrence at the change of the season in both spring and fall. Please see Photo #1.

DMR Calculation Check

BOD

June 2011

Date	Daily Value	Totalized Flow	Loading Value	7 day averages
6-1-11	4.6 mg/L	0.712 mgd	27.32 lbs/day	Wk1: 24.38 lbs/day
6-2-2011	3.6	0.714	21.44	
6-7-2011	4.18	0.757	26.33	Wk2: 24.6
6-8-2011	4.15	0.748	25.89	
6-9-2011	3.5	0.739	21.57	
6-14-2011	3.19	0.74	19.69	Wk3: 23.08
6-15-2011	4.22	0.756	26.61	
6-16-2011	3.66	0.752	22.95	
6-21-2011	3.35	0.732	20.45	Wk4: 23.23
6-22-2011	4.16	0.747	25.92	
6-23-2011	3.68	0.76	23.33	
6-28-2011	3.0	0.758	18.97	Wk5: 21.82
6-29-2011	3.78	0.766	24.15	
6-30-2011	3.5	0.765	22.33	
Totals:	52.57		326.95	

7 day average concentration value: 4.1 mg/L (permittee reported 4 mg/L)

30 day average concentration value: $52.57 \div 14 = 3.76$ mg/L (permittee reported 4 mg/L)

7 day average loading value: 24.6 lbs/day (permittee reported 25 lbs/day)

30 day average loading value: 23.42 lbs/day (permittee reported 24 lbs/day)

January 2012

Date	Daily Value	Totalized Flow	Loading Value	7 day averages
1-3-12	4.29 mg/L	0.778 mgd	27.84	Wk1: 26.87 lbs/day
1-4-12	4.41	0.815	29.98	
1-5-12	3.4	0.804	22.8	
1-10-12	3.18	0.817	21.67	Wk2: 18.57
1-11-12	2.74	0.803	18.35	
1-12-12	2.4	0.784	15.69	
1-17-12	4.57	0.839	31.98	Wk3:26.76
1-18-12	4.18	0.748	26.08	
1-19-12	3.35	0.795	22.21	
1-24-12	4.36	0.867	31.53	Wk4: 30.48
1-25-12	4.75	0.803	31.81	
1-26-12	4.37	0.771	28.1	
1-31-12	4.82	0.706	28.38	Wk5: 28.38
Totals:	50.82		336.42	

7 day average concentration value: 4.82 mg/L (permittee reported 4 mg/L)

30 day average concentration value: $50.82 \div 14 = 4.03$ mg/L (permittee reported 4 mg/L)

7 day average loading value: 30.48 lbs/day (permittee reported 30 lbs/day)

30 day average loading value: $336.42 \div 14 = 26.21$ lbs/day (permittee reported 25 lbs/day)

TSS
June 2011

Date	Daily Value	Totalized Flow	Loading Value	7 day averages
6-1-11	1.8 mg/L	0.712	10.69	Wk1: 9.9 lbs/day
6-2-11	1.53	0.714	9.11	
6-7-11	2.07	0.757	13.07	Wk2: 10.69
6-8-11	1.27	0.748	7.92	
6-9-11	1.8	0.739	11.09	
6-14-11	4.47	0.740	27.59	Wk3: 19.81
6-15-11	3.33	0.756	20.99	
6-16-11	1.73	0.752	10.85	
6-21-11	2.0	0.732	12.21	Wk4: 8.83
6-22-11	1.0	0.747	6.23	
6-23-11	1.27	0.760	8.05	
6-28-11	3.67	0.758	23.20	Wk5: 17.17
6-29-11	2.33	0.766	14.73	
6-30-11	2.13	0.765	13.59	
Totals:	30.4		189.32	

7 day average concentration value: 3.18 mg/L (permittee reported 3 mg/L)

30 day average concentration value: $30.4 \div 14 = 2.14$ mg/L (permittee reported 2 mg/L)

7 day average loading value: 19.81 lbs/day (permittee reported 21 lbs/day)

30 day average loading value: $189.32 \div 14 = 13.28$ lbs/day (permittee reported 14 lbs/day)

January 2012

Date	Daily Value	Totalized Flow	Loading Value	7 day averages
1-3-12	5.2 mg/L	0.778 mgd	33.74 lbs/day	Wk1: 25.22 lbs/day
1-4-12	3.93	0.815	26.71	
1-5-12	2.27	0.804	15.22	
1-10-12	1.4	0.817	9.54	Wk2: 12.77
1-11-12	2.47	0.803	16.54	
1-12-12	1.87	0.784	12.23	
1-17-12	3.6	0.839	25.19	Wk3: 20.55
1-18-12	3.93	0.748	24.52	
1-19-12	1.8	0.795	11.93	
1-24-12	6.87	0.867	49.68	Wk4: 42.57
1-25-12	4.67	0.803	31.28	
1-26-12	7.27	0.771	46.75	
1-31-12	7.4	0.706	43.57	Wk5: 43.57
Totals:	52.68		326.9	

7 day average concentration value: 7.4 mg/L (permittee reported 6 mg/L)

30 day average concentration value: $52.68 \div 14 = 4.49$ mg/L (permittee reported 4 mg/L)

7 day average loading value: 43.57 lbs/day (permittee reported 44 lbs/day)

30 day average loading value: $326.9 \div 14 = 28.94$ lbs/day (permittee reported 26 lbs/day)

NMED/SWQB

Official Photograph Log

Photo # 1

Photographer: Sarah Holcomb	Date: 11-29-2012 (date stamp on photo is incorrect)	Time: 0939 hours
City/County: Belen/Valencia County		
Location: Belen Wastewater Treatment Plant		
Subject: Outfall from the WWTP; Please note accumulated foam in drainage canal downstream from WWTP discharge.		

