Village of Stoddard
Special Village Board Meeting
June 27th, 2024, 4:00 p.m.

The Village Board met in special session. Roll call: Bob Wurtzel, Scott Chiples, Steve Davis and Diane Olson.
Minutes: None.
Appearances: None.
Bills and Vouchers: None.
Committee Reports: None.
New Business:
a) Discussion on WI DNR Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR) Resolution 2024-04
Hatlestad passed out copies of the resolution and explained the grades and the actions required from the WI DNR.

Resolution or Owner's Statement

Name of Governing Body or Owner: Village of Stoddard
Date of Resolution or Action Taken: 6-27-24
Resolution Number: 2024-04
Date of Submittal:6-28-24
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO SPECIFIC CMAR SECTIONS (Optional for grade A or B. Required for grade C, D, or F):
Influent Flow and Loadings: Grade = B
Effluent Quality: BOD: Grade = A
Effluent Quality: TSS: Grade = D
Effluent Quality: Phosphorus: Grade = F
Ponds: Grade = F
Biosolids Quality and Management: Grade = A
Staffing: Grade = A
Operator Certification: Grade = C
Financial Management: Grade = A
Collection Systems: Grade = A
(Regardless of grade, response required for Collection Systems if SSOs were reported)
ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO THE OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE AND ANY GENERAL COMMENTS
(Optional for G.P.A. greater than or equal to 3.00, required for G.P.A. less than 3.00)
G.P.A. = 2.46

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Total Suspended Solids)

1. Effluent Total Suspended Solids Results
Total Number of Points 32
1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?
Due to the lag between sampling and receiving results, it wasn't clear that the monthly average for June had been exceeded until the final result was received in July. As soon as we realized there was a problem with the monthly average, and we had room in the system to hold more water, we closed the final valve and stopped discharging altogether.
The July monthly average is the result of just one test. Discharge was stopped before the test result was even received for that test.
Total Points Generated 32
Score (100 - Total Points Generated) 68
Section Grade D

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Phosphorus)

1. Effluent Phosphorus Results
Total Number of Points 60
1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?
Discharge was stopped, repairs were made to the control structure between ponds 2 & 3, where ferric is injected and mixed. Proper chemical treatment was resumed and effluent phosphorus returned to below 1 mg/L.
Total Points Generated 60
Score (100 - Total Points Generated) 40
Section Grade F

Ponds And Lagoon Leakage

1. Pond Lining
1.1 What material was used to line your ponds?
PVC
2. Flow Measurements
2.1 Did you measure influent flow to your wastewater ponds or lagoons?
Yes (0 points)
No (40 points) (Go to question 6)
2.1.1 Method of influent flow measurement:
Magmeter
2.2 Did you measure effluent flow discharged from your wastewater system either to the land disposal system or to the receiving stream?
Yes (0 points)
No (40 points) (Go to question 6)
No Discharge (0 points)
2.2.1 Method of effluent flow measurement:
V-Notch Weir Gate
3. Total Flow Volumes
3.1 Total monthly influent and effluent flow volumes from the pond/lagoon system during the last calendar year.
Total Monthly
Influent Volume
Total Monthly
Effluent Volume
1.3966 JANUARY 1.3956
1.2663 FEBRUARY 1.2964
1.3646 MARCH 1.235
1.5458 APRIL
1.5823 MAY 1.6029
1.3585 JUNE 1.5296
1.3713 JULY .2711
1.3298 AUGUST
1.3571 SEPTEMBER
1.492 OCTOBER
1.4398 NOVEMBER 1.5236
1.3846 DECEMBER 1.506
16.8887 YEARLY TOTAL 10.3602
3.2 From the Yearly Total influent and effluent volumes above, total effluent is divided by total influent and converted to a percent of volume loss.
Total effluent, MG => 10.3602
---------- ---------- = 0.613 <= effl / infl ratio
Total influent, MG => 16.8887
Conversion to a percent of volume loss:
(1-effl/infl ratio) * 100 = 38.7 % of influent lost and not discharged with effluent
4. Surface Area
4.1 What was the total wastewater surface area of the ponds/lagoons at operating level (do not include seepage cells)?
2.3 Acres
5. Leakage Rate Estimation
5.1 Total influent volume (in MG) minus total effluent volume (in MG) plus or minus the change in pond/lagoon storage (in MG) is the net wastewater loss. The net loss divided by 0.000365 equals the estimated leakage amount in gpd.
Total Annual Influent (MG) 16.8887
Total Annual Effluent (MG) 10.3602
Estimated Net Loss (MG) 6.5285
Estimated Leakage Amount (gpd) 17886
If you have a *Department approved* method for determining a change in storage volume, enter the storage change last year in MG below.
Storage Increase: Enter amount in MG ->
Storage Decrease: Enter amount in MG ->
5.2 CMAR Estimated Leakage Rate in gallons per acre per day (gpad): The CMAR Estimated

Leakage Rate in gpad is the leakage amount in gpd (from part 5.1) divided by the total pond surface area (from question 4).
Leakage Amount
(gpd)
Acres CMAR Estimated
Leakage Rate
17886 divided by 2.3 = 7777
6. On Site Leakage Testing
6.1 Did you conduct and on-site, field water balance/leakage test on your ponds or lagoons that was approved by the Department and is still valid?
Yes Year
No
If yes, what was the field Test Calculated Leakage Rate for your ponds/lagoons?
gpad
NOTE: if 6.1 is answered Yes, the value entered above in gpad will be used in 7.1 to compute points generated.
6.2 Leakage Rate Comments: None
7. Estimated Leakage Rate and Points
7.1 The CMAR Estimated Leakage Rate (from 5) is used to determine the points generated in the table below.
If an approved field test was conducted and the results are still valid and accepted by the Department, the Field Calculated Leakage rate (from 5.2) is used to determine the points earned from the table below
gpad points
0 - 1,000 0
1,001 - 2,000 10
2,001 - 4,000 20
4,001 - 7,000 30
> 7,000
Based on the leakage rate in gpad, the points earned are: **40**
Total Points Generated 40
Score (100 - Total Points Generated) 60
Section Grade F

Hatlestad reported that due to a valve break at the plant some of the sections, TSS, Phosphorus and Ponds required a response. The system is in good shape despite the poor grades, repairs were made and the plant is running fine now.

Phosphorus influent will start being checked to obtain a base testing #.

Motion Davis, second Chiples to approve the 2023 CMAR. All aye, motion carried.