

Recycled Water Reuse Program

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

Coeur d'Alene Regional Office

Bayview Water and Sewer District 2018 Annual Report Review

Date Completed: January 23, 2019

Completed by: Chris Westerman, EIT

Department of Environmental Quality - Reuse Program

Reuse Permit: Annual Report Review Form

1 Preliminary Information							
1.1 Reviewer							
1.1.1 Name and Title	Chris Westerman, EIT Associate Engineer						
1.1.2 Office (Work Station)	☐ Technical Services ☐ BRO ☐ CRO ☐ IFRO ☐ State Program Office ☐ LRO ☐ PRO ☐ TFRO						
1.1.3 Address	2110 Ironwood Parkway Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814						
1.1.4 Phone; e-mail	Phone: (208) 666-4611 e-mail: chris.westerman@deq.idaho.gov						
1.2 Annual Report							
1.2.1 Document Date:	December 31, 2018						
1.2.2 Received Date:	January 2, 2019						
1.2.3 Time Period Covered:	Beginning Date: November 1, 2017 End Date: October 31, 2018						
1.2.4 Received by Due Date?	Yes ⊠ No □ Comments: Received on January 2, 2019						
1.3 Date of last Annual Report Review and Reviewer	Date: March 2, 2018 Reviewer Name: Chris Westerman						
1.4 Reuse Summary Data: Recycled Water and Constituents applied to reuse site	Recycled Water applied: 4.81 million gallons Nitrogen: 2,162 pounds Phosphorus: NA COD: NA						
1.5 Signature of Reviewer and Date	Chris Waterman Date: January 23, 2019						

2 Facility Information							
2.1 Perm	nittee Name	Bayview Water and Sewer District					
2.2 Perm	nit Number	M-105-04					
2.3 Perm Date	nit Expiration	July 1, 2025					
2.4 Facil	lity Type	 ✓ Slow Rate □ Rapid Infiltration □ Overland Flow □ Aquifer Recharge □ Other 					
2.5 Recy Type	vcled Water	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
2.6 Facil	ity Contact Inform	mation					
	ility Contact (name title)	Sharon Meyer, Chairman (See Modification #2)					
2.6.2 Add	Iress	Bayview Water and Sewer District P.O. Box 637 Bayview, Idaho 83803					
2.6.3 Pho	ne and e-mail	Phone: (208) 683-3948 e-mail: <u>bwsd@frontier.com</u>					
_	onal Office diction	□BRO ⊠CRO □ IFRO □ LRO □ PRO □ TFRO					

3 Hydraulic Loading (Recycled Water	er and Supplemental Irrigation Water)
3.1 Is the land application site hydraulically loaded within permit limits?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable
Comments: The permittee irrigated nearly 4.81 million galle (Figure 1).	ons (MG) of recycled water during the 2018 irrigation season
Total recycled water irrigated 2018.	in millions of gallons from 2010-
3.63	4.92 5.03 4.81 4.81
2010 2011 2012 2	2013 2014 2016 2018
Figure 1 – Recycl	ed water volumes (MG)
3.2 Are hydraulic loading calculations correct?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable
Comments: Calculations appear to be correct when compar	red to DEQ staff calculations.
3.3 Are only permitted sites being used for land application?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable
Comments: The permittee irrigates three (3) management u site.	nits consisting of approximately 20 acres of a native forested

3.4	loading	growing sea g substantia equirement	ılly at th	e irrigati						
	water i	equirement	ι (1 11 Ιζ)	•	Ye	s No	Not Known	Not Rev	newed N	ot Applicable
Comments: Hydraulic loading rates (HLR) for each management unit are substantially at or below the irrigation water requirement (Figure 2-4). This is acceptable for a forested site. Operator records show that each management unit is made up of two or three independent zones. Future annual reports should include the approximate area for each zone for recording purposes.										
	С	lydraulic lo ompared to eason.								
								1		
			Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	
		—HLR	0.00	0.00	1.95	4.55	4.83	4.33	0.79	
		IWR	1.62	4.33	5.83	8.72	7.3	4.04	0.88	
			Figure 2	2 – 2018 HLF	Rs compare	d to the I	WR for MU-01	0501		

Hydraulic loading rates in inches for management unit MU-10502 compared to the irrigation water requirement for the 2018 growing season. May Jul Oct Apr Jun Aug Sep HLR 0.00 0.00 0.36 0.80 0.87 1.26 0.34 -IWR 4.33 7.3 1.62 5.83 8.72 4.04 0.88 Figure 3 – 2018 HLRs compared to the IWR for MU-10502 Hydraulic loading rates in inches for management unit MU-10503 compared to the irrigation water requirement for the 2018 growing season. Apr May Jun Jul Oct Aug Sep HLR 0.00 0.00 0.92 3.04 2.25 2.24 0.71 IWR 1.62 4.33 5.83 8.72 7.3 4.04 88.0 Figure 4 – 2018 HLRs compared to the IWR for MU-10503 3.5 Are non-growing season recycled Xwater loading rates within permitted limits? Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable

4 Nutrient / Constituent Loading and Cropping								
4.1 Which nutrients and/or constituents	⊠ Nitrogen □ Phosphorus □ COD □ BOD							
have loading limits in the permit?	☐ Salt (i.e. NVDS, TDS, TDIS) ☐ Other ☐ None							
Comments: Total nitrogen loading is limited to 144 pounds per acre (lbm/ac) annually for each management unit (Permit M-105-04, Section 4.3, p.11).								
4.2 Are nutrients / constituents land								
applied within limits of the permit?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: Total nitrogen loading rates for each management the 2018 growing season (Figure 6).	ent unit were less than the total nitrogen limit of 144 lb/ac for							
Total nitrogen loading rates (lbm/ac) for each management unit during the 2018 growing season. The data is shown as a running total in each month. Annual limit = 144 lb/ac 120 - 100 - 80 - 60 - 40 - 100								
20 - 0	lul Ave Oct							
Apr May Jun —— MU-10501 —— MU-10502	Jul Aug Sep Oct MU-10503 Total N limit							
Figure 6 – DEQ total nitrogen loading	assessment for the 2018 growing season.							
4.3 Are nutrient / constituent loading calculations correct?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: Calculations appear to be correct when compared	ed to DEQ staff calculations.							
4.4 Are crops grown on recycled water land treatment acreage?								
Comments The committee insight of the (2)	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
site.	nits consisting of approximately 20 acres of a native forested							
4.5 Are crop yields typical for the region?								
	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: Not applicable; natural forested sites are not expected to produce a typical crop yield.								

4.6 Are crop uptake calculations done correctly?	□ □ □ □ ⊠ Ver No. Net Verson Net Bookered, Net Applicable								
	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable								
Comments: Not applicable.									
5 Monitoring									
5.1 Which media are required to be	☐ Wastewater ☐ Recycled Water								
sampled in the permit during this	☐ Ground Water ☐ Plant Tissue								
reporting period?									
	☐ Irrigation Water ☐ Soils ☐ Other								
Comments:									
Ground water monitoring									
 Three (3) on-site piezometers to verify depth Recycled water monitoring 	to ground water levels (Permit M-105-04, Section 5.2, p.14).								
Monthly total nitrogen (TKN, nitrate as N, an	d nitrite as N)								
	ting occurs (Permit M-105-04, Section 5.1.1, p.14). Total								
and inches.	is required to be monitored and reported in millions of gallons								
Soil monitoring									
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ce) annually in October (Permit M-105-04, Section 5.3, p.15). urface) annually in October (Permit M-105-04, Section 5.3,								
p.15).	indee/ dimidally in October (1 crime w 105 04, Section 5.5,								
5.2 Ground Water Monitoring									
5.2.1 Is the facility reporting monitoring data as required in the permit?									
required in the permit:	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable								
Comments: The reuse permit requires that the permittee mo	nitor the depth to ground water monthly to ensure there is a								
minimum vertical buffer of 36-inches between the ground s	urface and the ground water level. Based on the submitted								
annual report, the permittee indicates all ground water moni ground water was met.	toring was completed and the minimum vertical separation to								
5.2.2 Are correct analytical methods used?									
Ž									
	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable								
Comments: There are three (3) monitoring piezometers loc level meter with footage marked for every 1/100 th foot (Bay									
5.2.3 Do monitoring data indicate compliance									
with permit limits (and Ground Water Quality Rule IDAPA 58.01.11 standards									
where applicable)?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable								
Comments: The permittee is only required to provide meas vertical separation are met (DEQ 2015b).	urements to the ground water level demonstrating 36-inches of								
vertical separation are met (DEQ 2015b).									

5.2.4	Has the facility provided analyses/ interpretation of ground water data? If yes, summarize interpretation and/or add DEQ comments below.	⊠ Yes	□ No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable
Commer	nts: No comment.					
5.3	Recycled Water / Irrigation Water					
5.3.1	Is the facility reporting monitoring data as required in the permit?		\boxtimes			
	required in the perime:	Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable
during th	nts: There was one instance in which the permittee value week of June 17 th through June 23 rd due to laboral on the June 2018 record sheet Accurate Testing La	tory re	strictio	ons. It is DEQ	's understanding	based on the note
This is a	cceptable to DEQ with the following comments:					
•	Future operator samples should be coordinated with	th the l	aborat	ory prior to su	bmitting.	
5.3.2	Are correct analytical methods used?	\boxtimes				
		Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable
	nts: The analytical methods appear correct based on ets provided with the annual report submittal.	a revie	ew of	the standard m	ethods recorded	on the laboratory

5.3.3 Are current recycled water characteristics still as described in permit application												
	materials?	Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable						
Comments: DEQ staff compared the constituent concentrations reported in 2018 to the historical data (Figure 7). It should be noted, this data set is not complete at this time.												
	Total nitrogen concentrations (2013-2018) compared to the 2018 growing season concentrations in miligrams per liter.											
	180 - 160 -				•							
	140 - 120 -				165.09							
	100 -											
	80 - 60 - -		7									
	40 - 40.03 27.05	49.12	28	53.8								
	0			1	1							
	Jun Jul	Aug		Sep	Oct							
	♦ Mean	201	8 Valı	ıes								
	Figure 7 – Typical nitrogen concentrations from 2	013-201	8 com	pared to the 20	118 values for eac	h month.						
5.3.4	Which recycled water constituents have concentration limits in the permit?		Vitroge	en 🗆 Phosp	horus 🗆 Turb	oidity 🗆 TSS						
	1	⊠ T	otal C	Coliform 🗆 (Other Microbial	☐ Other ☐ None						
	s: Total coliform is limited to a 5-day median val a exceed 230 total coliform organisms per 100 ml					nL and no single						
5.3.5	Are constituent concentrations within limits of the permit?		\boxtimes									
	of the permit.	Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable						
	s: There was one instance where the permittee exc			ngle sample lir	nit of 230 MPN	/100mL.						
1. August 28, 2018 – single result was >1,600 MPN/100mL. There were no additional single sample exceedances or any median sample exceedances. DEQ was contacted regarding this exceedance in an e-mail dated August 31, 2018. The District's operators suspect it has something to do with the chlorine residual being less than 2.0 mg/L, but it is not clear why this occurred. Operators believed this incident was resolved (Hansen 2018b).												
5.3.6	Has the facility provided analyses/ interpretation of recycled water/irrigation	.										
	water data? If yes, summarize interpretation	Vas	∐ No	Not Vnoum	Not Daviewed	Not Applicable						
	and/or add DEQ comments below.	Yes	140	INOL KHOWII	not Keviewed	Not Applicable						
Comments	s: No comment.											

5.4	Soils							
5.4.1	Is the facility reporting monitoring data as required in the permit?		\boxtimes					
		Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable		
Comments: Soil samples were taken on November 6, 2018 at each soil management unit for NO ₂ +NO ₃ as N and ammonia as N. As mentioned in the annual report, each management unit subsample was composited into a single depth sample for the site (Hansen 2019). The intent of the permit was to monitor each management unit independently. Future soil sampling must be completed for each depth at each management unit independently. This means the operator should be submitting six (6) soil samples to the laboratory for analysis.								
5.4.2	Are correct analytical methods used?		\boxtimes					
		Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable		
Commer by depth	nts: As mentioned above, the operator combined all	manag	gemen	t unit subsamp	les into a single	composite sample		
5.4.3	Has the facility provided analyses/ interpretation of soils data? If yes, summarize interpretation and/or add DEQ comments below.	X Yes	□ No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable		
Comme	nts: The permittee acknowledged the above mention	ned erro	or in t	ne 2018 annua	l report (Hansen	2019).		
5.5	Plant Tissue Monitoring							
5.5.1	Is the facility reporting monitoring data as required in the permit?					\boxtimes		
		Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable		
Comme	nts: Not applicable; the permittee is not required to r	nonito	r plan	t tissue in the c	eurrent permit.			
5.5.2	Are correct analytical methods used?					\boxtimes		
		Yes	No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable		
Comme	nts: Not applicable; the permittee is not required to r	nonito	r plan	t tissue in the c	eurrent permit.			
5.5.3	Has the facility provided analyses/ interpretation of plant tissue data? If yes, summarize interpretation and/or add DEQ comments below.	Yes	□ No	Not Known	Not Reviewed			
Comme	Comments: Not applicable; the permittee is not required to monitor plant tissue in the current permit.							

5.6 Other Monitoring								
5.6.1 Briefly Describe Other Monitoring Required: The current permit does not include any monitoring requirements in addition to the monitoring requirements described in Section 5.1 above.								
5.6.2 Is the facility reporting monitoring data as required in the permit?								
	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: Not applicable; there is not additional monitor	oring requirements in the reuse permit.							
5.6.3 Are correct analytical methods used?								
	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: Not applicable; there is not additional monitor	oring requirements in the reuse permit.							
5.6.4 Has the facility provided analyses/ interpretation of other monitoring data? If								
yes, summarize interpretation and/or add								
DEQ comments below.	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: Not applicable; there is not additional monitor	oring requirements in the reuse permit.							
6 Other Permit Conditions, General	Comments, and Recommendations							
6.1 Were acts of noncompliance reported								
as required by the permit?	Yes No Not Known Not Reviewed Not Applicable							
Comments: There appears to be two noncompliance issue	s:							
 Total coliform exceedance – There was one instance where the number of total coliform organisms reported by the laboratory exceeded the single sample limit (230 MPN/100mL) for a sample taken on August 28, 2018. 								
 Soil sampling – The operator appears to have combined the subsamples from each management unit into a single composite sample by depth. The intent of the reuse permit was to have depth composited samples for each soil monitoring unit (i.e. management unit). This issue is acknowledged by the permittee in the 2018 annual report. 								

6.2	update included in the annual report?			Not Known	☐ Not Reviewed	Not Applicable
Comme	nts: The 2018	annual report includes the current stat	us of comp	liance activities		
Comp	oliance Act	ivity	Due D	ate	Status	
CA-10		Submit an updated plan of operations (PO)	Januar	y 1, 2016	Approved in a letter August 12	dated
CA-10	05-02	Submit a quality assurance project plan (QAPP)	Januar	y 1, 2016	Approved in a letter August 12	dated
CA-10	05-03	Complete seepage testing on the storage lagoon. Submit a seepage testing procedures to DEQ for review and approval at least 42 days prior to testing.	June 3	0, 2019	Pending	
CA-10	05-04	Submit an updated Silviculture plan.	Decem	ber 31, 2019	Pending	_
CA-10	05-05	Pre-application workshop	July 1,	2024	Pending	
CA-10	05-06	Submit a permit renewal application	Januar	y 1, 2025	Pending	
6.3	repairs, ar	alts of backflow testing, and replacements included?	Yes No			Not Applicable
		no backflow assemblies at the reuse faced on October 12, 2017 (Hansen 2018		re is one backfl	ow assembly at t	he tri-plex lift
6.4	maintenar equipmen maintenar	cussion of major nce activities (major t replacement, lagoon liner nce, wastewater treatment reuse facility maintenance)	Yes No	Not Known	Not Reviewed	Not Applicable
Comme	nts: There we	re no major maintenance activities dur	ing the 201	8 growing seas	on (Hansen 2019)).
6.5		e follow-up items from a prev current status in the Comment		-	view describe	e these items
Comme	nts: The 2018	annual report appears to have address	ed those ite	ems discussed in	the 2016 annual	l report review.
6.6	Is the ann	ual report submitted lly complete?	\boxtimes			Not Applicable
Comme	nts: The annu	al report appears to be substantially co	mplete.			

6.7 Recommendations

Zone acreage – DEQ is requesting future annual reports include the zone acreage for a better understanding of how irrigation occurs between each zone and how it relates to the hydraulic loading rates reported for each management unit.

Total coliform exceedance – The total coliform single sample result from August 28, 2018 was greater than 1,600 MPN/100mL. The operator contacted DEQ on August 31, 2018 and suspects this was an isolated incident that has been resolved. DEQ agrees with this assessment.

Soil sampling – It appears soil sampling was not completed as required by the reuse permit. The operator composited all soil monitoring units into a single depth sample. The reuse permit requires soil samples are taken for depths of 0-12 inches; 12-24 inches; and 24-36 inches for the three designated soil monitoring units (i.e. management units). Additional details can be reviewed in Reuse Permit M-105-04, Section 5.3, p. 15.

Compliance activity CA-105-03 requires the District to **submit seepage testing results** for the lagoon no later than June 30, 2019. The District will need to submit seepage testing procedures to be reviewed and approved by DEQ at least 42 days prior to the planned seepage test.

Compliance activity CA-105-04 requires the District to submit an **updated Silviculture plan** as prepared by a professional silviculturalist.

6.8 References:

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. M-105-04 Bayview Water and Sewer District, Staff Analysis supporting reuse permit issuance (DEQ 2015a).

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. Bayview Water and Sewer District Reuse Permit M-105-04. (DEQ 2015b).

Bayview Water and Sewer District. Wastewater Collection, Treatment and Reuse System Operation and Maintenance Manual (Bayview 2016).

Water Systems Management Inc. 2017 *Annual Report, Bayview Water and Sewer District*, Permit M-105-04. (Hansen 2018a)

Water Systems Management Inc. *Subject: BAYVIEW WATER & SEWER DISTRICT PERMIT BACTERIA EXCEEDANC*, August 31, 2018. (Hansen 2018b).

Water Systems Management Inc. 2018 Annual Report, Bayview Water and Sewer District, Permit M-105-04. (Hansen 2019).

•