

# **EXHIBIT K**

**From:** [Peter VonLangen](mailto:Peter.VonLangen)  
**To:** [Craig Murray](mailto:Craig.Murray)  
**Cc:** [fatima.ty@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:fatima.ty@epamail.epa.gov); [greenberg.ken@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:greenberg.ken@epamail.epa.gov); [max.kuker@ogenv.com](mailto:max.kuker@ogenv.com); [Harvey Packard](mailto:Harvey.Packard); [Lauren Alderman](mailto:Lauren.Alderman); [Michael Thomas](mailto:Michael.Thomas); [Philip Isorena](mailto:Philip.Isorena); [Sheila Soderberg](mailto:Sheila.Soderberg)  
**Subject:** RE: TRANSMITTAL OF PG ENVIRONMENTAL'S NPDES COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION (CEI) REPORT, PERMIT CA0047364, ORDER NO. R3-2011-0003 CARPINTERIA SANITARY DISTRICT, SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, WDID 3 42 010 1001  
**Date:** Friday, May 11, 2012 9:40:01 AM

---

Hi Craig,

Sorry for the delay, we have a lot on our plates. The facility is in compliance with its permit and no enforcement is pending from the inspection. The inspection was looking over the facility in great detail and some of the findings were written in a dry inspection compliance tone that may have made it sound worse than reality. The same could be said for the other 3 facilities on the south coast that were inspected by PG Environmental staff from who I had the impression thought the facilities were generally well run. The same could not be said for Cuyama who received a Notice of Violation for the inspection. For Carpinteria it seems much was made of the algae over some of the weirs, which to me didn't seem like a huge deal that merited an unsatisfactory mark in several places through the report. However, I am not a waste water engineer and am very new at learning how these facilities operate so sent the report as it was drafted. The report is a public document since it resides in our files but we don't plan on publishing the document or sending out for mass consumption. You can respond in the next Annual Report and can also send us an email or letter if you wish to have something additional in the file.

Best Regards,  
Peter

Peter von Langen, Ph.D., P.G.  
Engineering Geologist  
Central Coast Water Board  
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401  
[pvonlangen@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:pvonlangen@waterboards.ca.gov)  
Phone 805-549-3688  
Fax 805-788-3580

>>> Craig Murray 05/11/12 8:38 AM >>>

Peter - I have not heard back from you or anyone at Region 3 following my email on Tuesday this week. I'm resending to make sure it hit your inbox. This is an important issue for my District. A reply would be helpful to me. Thanks. Craig.

Craig Murray, P.E.  
General Manager  
Carpinteria Sanitary District  
5300 Sixth Street  
Carpinteria, CA 93013  
P 805.684.7214  
C 805.451.7804

From: Craig Murray  
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2012 1:55 PM  
To: VonLangen, Peter@Waterboards  
Cc: [greenberg.ken@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:greenberg.ken@epamail.epa.gov); [fatima.ty@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:fatima.ty@epamail.epa.gov); [max.kuker@pgenv.com](mailto:max.kuker@pgenv.com); [Isorena, Philip@Waterboards](mailto:Isorena,Philip@Waterboards); [Alderman, Lauren@Waterboards](mailto:Alderman,Lauren@Waterboards); [markb@carpsan.com](mailto:markb@carpsan.com); [ssoderberg@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:ssoderberg@waterboards.ca.gov)  
Subject: RE: TRANSMITTAL OF PG ENVIRONMENTAL'S NPDES COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION (CEI) REPORT, PERMIT CA0047364, ORDER NO. R3-2011-0003 CARPINTERIA SANITARY DISTRICT, SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, WDID 3 42 010 1001

Hi Peter -

We received this email transmitting the NPDES CEI Report for our facility on Friday. I was surprised and disappointed to read the findings as they differed remarkably from the comments we got in the exit interview from PG Environmental staff. I know you had to leave early from the inspection that day and were not at the wrap up meeting, but every indication was that our treatment facility and our record keeping/reporting was outstanding. Aside from one spreadsheet calculation error which was identified and corrected that day, the message we got was that everything was great. As you know, we take enormous pride in the maintenance and condition of our facility and have continued the practices that earned us the 2008 CWEA Plant of the Year Award for the entire state. I presume that you have reviewed the report and I wonder if you concur with the findings or if they were surprising to you also based on your participation in the inspection.

I have a few questions. I would like to know how we can or should respond to the findings of this report. Is there a process to dispute the findings? What is its purpose? Will it result in enforcement proceedings or will there be any response from the RWQCB, SWRCB or EPA? Will it be published and made publicly available?

I have to present this report to my Board of Directors and explain to them what it means and why it is so negatively characterizes our operations. Your prompt reply is greatly appreciated.

Thanks.

Craig Murray, P.E.  
General Manager  
Carpinteria Sanitary District  
5300 Sixth Street  
Carpinteria, CA 93013  
P 805.684.7214  
C 805.451.7804

From: Alderman, Lauren@Waterboards [<mailto:L.Alderman@waterboards.ca.gov>]  
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2012 11:43 AM  
To: Craig Murray  
Cc: VonLangen, Peter@Waterboards; greenberg.ken@epamail.epa.gov; fatima.ty@epamail.epa.gov; max.kuker@pgenv.com; Isorena, Philip@Waterboards  
Subject: TRANSMITTAL OF PG ENVIRONMENTAL'S NPDES COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION (CEI) REPORT, PERMIT CA0047364, ORDER NO. R3-2011-0003 CARPINTERIA SANITARY DISTRICT, SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, WDID 3 42 010 1001

Please find the attached letter in PDF format regarding the subject project. If you have questions regarding the CEI report, please contact Peter von Langen at (805) 549-3688 [pvonlangen@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:pvonlangen@waterboards.ca.gov) or Sheila Soderberg (805) 549-3592 at [ssoderberg@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:ssoderberg@waterboards.ca.gov).

The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board is increasing its efforts to transmit correspondence and other information electronically, reducing the amount of paper used, and increasing the speed of which information is distributed. Therefore, you are receiving the attached correspondence for the subject site from the Central Coast Water Board in a Portable Data Format (PDF). If you need help opening this document please refer to the link below:

<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>





# Carpinteria Sanitary District

5300 Sixth Street, Carpinteria, CA 93013  
(805) 684-7214 • Admin Fax (805) 684-7213 • Plant Fax (805) 566-6599

January 28, 2013

Mr. Peter Von Langen  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Central Coast Region  
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

**Subject: Response to Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI) Report  
Carpinteria Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility  
PERMIT CA0047364, ORDER NO. R3-2011-0003**

Dear Peter,

On December 14, 2011, PG Environmental, on behalf of USEPA, conducted a NPDES Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI) at the District's wastewater treatment facility. The stated purpose of the inspection was to determine the accuracy and reliability of the District's self-monitoring and reporting program, and to review the facility site.

The District received the written CEI Report in May 2012. Despite very positive indications from PG Environmental staff during the exit interview with respect to the facility condition and the overall compliance status, the report assigned "marginal" and "unsatisfactory" overall ratings in certain reporting categories. The District strongly objects to these findings and this letter is being transmitted to document our response to the report and our specific objections to certain findings.

As you know, the Carpinteria Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility received the prestigious Small Plant of the Year Award for 2008 from the California Water Environment Association (CWEA). We take great pride in the condition of our facility, specifically with respect to its operation and maintenance. As a participant in the CEI inspection, perhaps you may also have difficulty reconciling the appearance of our facility with the findings of the PG Environmental report.

## **Facility Site Review – Algae Growth on Weirs**

The CEI report points to algae accumulation on the weirs in the secondary clarifiers as a significant operational problem. This finding propagates throughout the report and results in a "marginal" overall rating in the Facility Site Review section. In the District's opinion, this issue is grossly overstated. The minor algae growth observed on the fiberglass weirs during the inspection is common and does not impact effluent quality.

The District implements a comprehensive asset management system and maintenance program to establish weir cleaning schedules and to document cleaning activities and weir conditions. The secondary weirs are cleaned with high pressure water on Tuesday and Friday each week. The observed algae buildup during the inspection existed in two small areas as shown in the pictures. Flow over v-notches was potentially affected in no more than three feet of weir length out of a total of 560 linear feet. This represents less than 0.5 % blockage. There was no short circuiting and this representation in the CEI report is false and misleading. Based on the experience of our plant operators, the amount of algae growth on the weirs at the time of the inspection was insignificant.

Following the CEI inspection, maintenance data was review to confirm that the weirs had been washed the day prior to the inspection. While algae growth may not be common in January in Colorado (where the PG Environmental staff are located), in Southern California the sunny winter conditions promote algae growth over a short period of time. The District strongly objects to the report findings and ratings with respect to the issue of algae growth on the secondary clarifier weirs.

#### **Self-Monitoring Program – Influent Monitoring Location**

The CEI report assigned an "unsatisfactory" overall rating for the District's Self-Monitoring Program. This was based on the fact that the District has intermittent return flows (e.g. dewatering filtrate) that are conveyed to the facility headworks upstream of the influent flow meter. Technically, the District is indeed measuring and reporting a confluent flow rate (influent plus return flows) instead of a discrete influent flow rate.

The District does not dispute this finding, as this pumping/piping configuration has existing at least since a major facility upgrade that commenced in 1993. The RWQCB regulatory staff is aware of this situation and it has not been identified as a compliance problem through at least four NPDES permit cycles. RWQCB inspectors and engineers have instead simply directed District staff to collect influent samples at times when there are no return flows, so that influent concentrations and mass loading values are accurately represented.

For several reasons, there is no simple or cost-effective way of conveying return flows to an alternate location, downstream of the influent flow meter. Doing so, would require construction of new pumping facilities in order to segregate site stormwater conveyance from an existing sewage lift station at the facility. Additional pumping facilities would be necessary to convey dewatering return flows. Both of these side streams are intermittent and generally insignificant when compared to the total influent flow rate.

While the District acknowledges that this may be considered a deficiency as it pertains to strict NPDES permit compliance, we believe that our self-monitoring program fully meets the intent of the discharge permit and results in accurate percent removal values in our regular reporting. We strongly object to the determination that our Self-Monitoring Program is "unsatisfactory".

#### **Other Findings**

The CEI report identified two other compliance issues. The District was reporting the daily average total chlorine residual concentration based on a spreadsheet calculation using continuous chlorine residual monitoring values instead of the average of the daily grab sample

Mr. Peter Von Langen

Page 3 of 3

analyses. Although the manner of reporting would likely provide a more accurate representation of average residual chlorine concentration, we acknowledged this "deficiency" and it was corrected immediately, during the CEI process. Also, the District's refrigerated influent sampler did not contain a separate thermometer to verify/document internal temperature. A thermometer was installed in the unit immediately following the inspection.

### Closure

As stated above, the purpose of this letter is to object to the ratings put forth in the subject CEI report. The District operates and maintains its treatment facility to the highest standard of the industry. While we do not dispute the facts presented in the report, the ratings assigned grossly misrepresent the quality and character of our operation.

Please do not hesitate to contact the District if you require additional information. I can be reached at (805) 684-7214 x17 or by email at [MarkB@carpsan.com](mailto:MarkB@carpsan.com).

Sincerely,

CARPINTERIA SANITARY DISTRICT



Mark Bennett  
Operations Manager

cc: Craig Murray, P.E. – CSD General Manager