

FILED

July 28, 2017

INDIANA UTILITY  
REGULATORY COMMISSION

**COMPLAINANT'S EXHIBIT 1**

**SUGAR CREEK PACKING CO.**

**INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**CAUSE NO. 44948**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**RON HOLBROOK**

**OF SUGAR CREEK PACKING CO.**

**SPONSORING COMPLAINANT'S ATTACHMENTS RH-1 THROUGH RH-7**

**SUGAR CREEK PACKING CO.**

**Cause No. 44948**

**Direct Testimony of Ron Holbrook**

1   **I.    WITNESS BACKGROUND**

2   **Q.    Please state your name and business address.**

3   **A.**My name is Ron Holbrook and my business address is 1200 Enterprise Road, Cambridge  
4           City, Indiana 47327.

5   **Q.    By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

6   **A.**I am employed by Sugar Creek Packing Co., an Ohio Corporation that owns and operates a  
7           meat food processing plant in Cambridge City, Indiana for the purpose of producing raw  
8           meat into various retail products for both national and private label brands (“Sugar Creek” or  
9           “Complainant”). I am employed as Plant Manager with Sugar Creek.

10  **Q.    What is your educational and professional background?**

11  **A.**I have over 25 years of food manufacturing experience, with about 12 of those years as a  
12           Plant Manager. I have a BS degree in Organizational Leadership and Supervision from  
13           Purdue University.

14  **Q.    What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

15  **A.**The purpose of my testimony is to explain the relief requested by Sugar Creek in this  
16           proceeding and offer support for that relief. I offer testimony to explain the service issues  
17           and operational disruptions Sugar Creek has experienced as a result of Western Wayne

1 Regional Sewage District's ("WWRSD") capacity issues. I also offer testimony to explain  
2 and support the economic losses incurred by Sugar Creek as a result of such issues.

3 **II. SUGAR CREEK**

4 **Q. Please describe Sugar Creek.**

5 **A.** Sugar Creek is an Ohio corporation that was founded in 1966, when three investors opened  
6 our Washington Court House facility in Ohio. This original facility was and is a  
7 manufacturer of raw bacon. Over the last 50+ years, we have grown into a widely diversified  
8 food manufacturer that works with fifty of North America's largest, best known and most  
9 reliable food companies. Sugar Creek employs over 2,000 people in six manufacturing  
10 facilities, and serves clients across the U.S. and internationally.

11 **Q. Are any of these facilities located in Indiana?**

12 Yes. In 2015, Sugar Creek opened its 418,000 square foot facility in Cambridge City,  
13 Indiana. This is a state-of-the-art facility that offers the nation's largest commercial-scale  
14 Sous Vide operations, plus a host of additional capabilities, including three distinct high-  
15 volume cooking halls. These innovations will allow Sugar Creek to offer a variety of new,  
16 fully-cooked food solutions and compete in categories it has not previously participated in.

17 With new, exciting fully-cooked capabilities, coupled with a facility nearly four times larger  
18 than any existing Sugar Creek facility, Cambridge City makes it possible for us to more  
19 easily co-develop solutions for our partners and introduce innovative products with great  
20 consistency. Cambridge City is integral to Sugar Creek, and we are committed to the  
21 community, to Wayne County, and to Indiana.

1   **Q.     What is Sous Vide?**

2   **A.**     Sous Vide has been a staple of European cooking for decades. But until now, North  
3           American use of the technique has largely been limited to high-end, small-batch cooking.

4           Sugar Creek intends to change all of that with our Cambridge City facility. The plant houses  
5           several state-of-the-art cooking technologies, but the centerpiece of the facility is its large-  
6           scale sous vide operation.

7           In sous vide (pronounced “sue VEED”), the food is prepped, vacuum-packed and then  
8           cooked slowly and precisely in a circulated water bath. When the food reaches its optimal  
9           internal temperature and desired texture, it is quick-chilled and then refrigerated or frozen  
10          until it is ready to be served, either in a restaurant or in a consumer’s home.

11          It is our belief that sous vide preparation will revolutionize quality. It brings together a broad  
12          spectrum of efficiencies including better yields, less waste, consistency and food safety to  
13          produce a product that is unrivaled beyond the kitchens of the finest chefs.

14   **Q.     How is it that Sugar Creek came to be located in Cambridge City?**

15   **A.**     The facility was originally owned by Really Cool Foods (“RCF”), who announced in 2007  
16          that it was building the production complex and investing more than \$100 million. The  
17          Indiana Economic Development Corporation (“IEDC”) offered RCF a multi-million dollar  
18          package of tax credits and grants to fund infrastructure improvements. Wayne County  
19          donated the land and provided additional grants as well as tax abatement. It was the first  
20          development in the Wayne County Gateway Industrial Park located at the interchange of  
21          State Highway 1 and Interstate 70.

1 The facility opened in October 2008, but it was always behind its scheduled ramp-up due to  
2 numerous challenges and setbacks. It originally opened with only 250 of the originally  
3 projected 1,000 jobs, and it never met the employment targets. In 2011, RCF abruptly closed  
4 the facility.

5 Sugar Creek purchased the facility in 2012 and expanded its footprint from 77,000 square  
6 feet to 418,000 square feet. We have invested an additional \$130 million in the facility since  
7 acquiring it. Late in 2015, Sugar Creek began operations. Today, we operate three shifts and  
8 employ more than 400 workers. We are looking to expand our operations further as we are  
9 presently running at roughly 40% of total planned capacity. Obviously additional jobs will  
10 come with this expansion. The plant is currently operating two of the three production areas,  
11 and neither of those areas is at full capacity. As we add equipment to fully utilize the facility,  
12 we expect to continue to add jobs.

13 **III. WWRSD CAPACITY ISSUES AND ECONOMIC IMPACT**

14 **Q. Does Sugar Creek require considerable amounts of water for its industrial operations**  
15 **at Cambridge City?**

16 **A.** Yes. We use considerable amounts of water in manufacturing our food products. A portion  
17 of the water that we purchase is consumed by the finished product, and another significant  
18 portion is lost due to evaporation. The largest amount of water that we purchase for  
19 industrial purposes is used for sanitation, where we nightly (third shift) tear down much of  
20 the equipment and clean everything from ceilings to floors. Water used, but not consumed in  
21 the product or lost to evaporation, is treated by Sugar Creek's industrial pretreatment facility  
22 and discharged to the sewer utility. In addition, we discharge wastewater to WWRSD for

1 other purposes, including water softening regeneration, boiler blow down, and condenser  
2 cooling tower.

3 **Q. Please discuss Sugar Creek's relationship to WWRSD.**

4 **A.** WWRSD is a regional sewage district that provides wastewater utility service to Sugar Creek  
5 at its Cambridge City, Indiana location. According to the website for Indiana Department of  
6 Environmental Management ("IDEM"), WWRSD is a regional district organized to provide  
7 wastewater collection and treatment service in parts of Wayne County, Indiana. WWRSD  
8 owns, manages, operates and controls plant and equipment for the collection and treatment of  
9 sewage. WWRSD is the sewer utility to which Sugar Creek discharges its treated industrial  
10 wastewater and its sanitary wastewater. As such, Sugar Creek is a customer of WWRSD.

11 **Q. How did Sugar Creek become a customer of WWRSD?**

12 **A.** RCF was already a customer of WWRSD when we acquired the facility.

13 **Q. Have you reviewed Mr. Rodden's testimony regarding the capacity certification**  
14 **received from WWRSD for Sugar Creek's pretreatment plant?**

15 **A.** Yes.  
16

17 **Q. Is WWRSD capable of collecting and treating 200,000 gallons per day from the Sugar**  
18 **Creek pretreatment facility?**

19 **A.** Not consistently. This capability has not been demonstrated in the year and a half that I have  
20 been employed at the plant.

1 **Q. When did Sugar Creek first experience service issues with WWRSD?**

2 **A.** As I testified, we began operations in late 2015. From that point, we began to ramp up our  
3 production to the point where we would ultimately need the 200,000 gallons per day from the  
4 pretreatment facility. Unfortunately, problems with WWRSD began very soon after we  
5 started operations. WWRSD has a lift station located at the Gateway Industrial Park  
6 servicing Sugar Creek and other customers. This lift station has frequently overflowed since  
7 we began operations. The first time that I am aware of an overflow was one that occurred on  
8 April 14, 2016. We learned of this overflow because someone mowing for the County  
9 Highway Department reported it to us. Since that time and continuing to today, we have  
10 chosen to monitor flow and, when necessary, scale back or shut down productions in order to  
11 avoid flooding the field surrounding WWRSD's manhole that we monitor. A detailed  
12 summary of the events surrounding this first overflow event are set forth in an email message  
13 from our employee Victor Dearman to several Sugar Creek employees, including me. This  
14 email is Attachment RH-1.

15 **Q. To your knowledge, has WWRSD reported the overflows at this lift station to the**  
16 **Indiana Department of Environmental Management ("IDEM")?**

17 **A.** Not that I'm aware of.

18 **Q. Do you have a record of Sugar Creek's monitoring of the manhole?**

19 **A.** Yes, directionally. We have been monitoring since the first overflow, but since May 22,  
20 2017, we have kept a written log that documents our monitoring and the times that we found  
21 the manhole to be full or overflowing. This is Attachment RH-2.

1 **Q. You say that Sugar Creek has been monitoring the lift station as a result. Please**  
2 **explain what this monitoring is and why Sugar Creek does it.**

3 **A.** No one has asked us to do this monitoring. We view ourselves as good stewards of the  
4 environment and we want to prevent or minimize these overflows. As a result, several times  
5 per shift, we send employees to inspect the lift station and monitor the level of the flows.  
6 When the flow level reaches a point that is too high such that an overflow is risked, we adjust  
7 our production operations to reduce our flows.

8 **Q. Has Sugar Creek experienced any disruptions to its daily operations or incurred any**  
9 **costs as a result of having to monitor its flow since the 2016 overflow event?**

10 **A.** Yes. Monitoring the water levels in the manhole has taken a significant portion of our  
11 technicians' time. They check the level frequently; it can be done as little as 4 or as many as  
12 6 times in a 12-hour shift. It can take up to 20 minutes or so to complete a check. This takes  
13 quite a bit of time away from their other duties. Until 2017, however, the capacity issue had  
14 not arisen to the point where operations were completely shut down. Starting in 2017, we  
15 experienced events that have caused considerable cost increases and at one point forced us to  
16 shut down the plant and send our workers home.

17 **Q. What happened starting in 2017 as a result of WWRSD's capacity issues?**

18 **A.** On January 19, 2017, Sugar Creek was forced to completely shut down operations as a result  
19 of WWRSD's inability to receive any flow from our production plant (the "January Event").  
20 The shutdown lasted for two full shifts and all employees were sent home for that period of  
21 time. During the shutdown period, our employees were forced to monitor flow every hour  
22 and restrict all flow to WWRSD. Because we could not send any flow to WWRSD, we were



1 forced to rent Frac Tanks to hold the water and store it on site. We rented the tanks to store  
2 the water until the pumps at the lift station could be made functional again. Our plan was to  
3 meter the water back in to our treatment plant during times of reduced flow, for example,  
4 weekends with no production. During this outage, we could not rent enough tanks and had to  
5 stop the operation and even pay to have water hauled away. Once the pumps were back  
6 online we had to keep up to 10 Frac Tanks (each holding approximately 20,000 gallons) so as  
7 to hold the water long enough to release the stored water gradually through the system  
8 without overloading the pumps again. Additionally, we held the tanks for a period of time  
9 while we determined whether or not the repair was going to be reliable.

10 **Q. Do you know what caused the January failure?**

11 **A.** Not officially. We are now more than six months after this failure and we still have not been  
12 told. We asked WWRSD to explain in discovery. Their response is Attachment RH-3.  
13 Response to Request 1.4 indicates that the lift station could not keep pace with the flows. It  
14 also indicates that a root cause analysis has been initiated, but still, 6 months later, they can  
15 tell us nothing definitive.

16 **Q. The response to Request 1.4 implies that WWRSD questions whether Sugar Creek's**  
17 **flows were within the 200,000 gpd at the time. Was Sugar Creek discharging more**  
18 **than 200,000 gpd at the time?**

19 **A.** No. Our records indicate an industrial discharge on January 15 was 128,299 gallons; on  
20 January 16, it was 142,052 gallons; and on January 17, it was 140,766 gallons.

1 **Q. Are there other flows besides the industrial pretreatment facility?**

2 **A.** There are, and until 2017, we did not have consistent data on how much wastewater  
3 discharges independent of the pretreatment facility. Until July 2017, the only flows that we  
4 know for certain are the flows that are measured by the meter at our pretreatment plant. We  
5 have water meters located throughout our production facility to help us better understand  
6 how we are using water in our processes. These meters are not calibrated for billing  
7 purposes but are more for informational purposes. We know, for instance, that our sanitary  
8 wastewater is not metered. We also know that water discharged during the regeneration of  
9 our softeners does not flow through the pretreatment facility. Following the events that came  
10 to a head in mid-January, 2017, we began building data that attempts to estimate our total  
11 actual daily flow (both from the pretreatment facility and from other sources). We have  
12 further revised this data to account for the fact that starting in January, we had the Frac Tanks  
13 onsite to hold water. There is an excel spreadsheet which is Attachment RH-4 that sets forth  
14 this revised analysis. A summary printout of the worksheet in this workbook that shows the  
15 daily pretreatment flow and the total estimated daily discharge (including wastewater not  
16 flowing through the pretreatment facility) is Attachment RH-5.

17 **Q. This shows a calculated total wastewater to WWRSD on the days you reported**  
18 **previously of 152,599, 195,238, and 197,958 gallons. Could this be the reason for the**  
19 **troubles that led to the shutdown of the plant on January 17, 2017?**

20 **A.** No. The capacity certificate is plainly for the pretreatment facility. But even if the capacity  
21 certificate was meant to cover all of the flows, none of these days exceeded 200,000 gallons.

1 **Q. Has WWRSD undertaken any repairs or improvements at its Lift Station since the**  
2 **January Event in an effort to prevent future failures?**

3 **A.** We asked that question in discovery in Request 1.4, and WWRSD provided no activities that  
4 they took in response. We were otherwise aware (and WWRSD mentions in its response to  
5 Request 1.5) that WWRSD installed new pumps in the lift station after the January Event.

6 **Q. Did the new pumps correct the problem?**

7 **A.** No. Originally it was encouraging; however, on May 22, 2017, Sugar Creek again found  
8 itself unable to discharge to the lift station.

9 **Q. Please describe what happened on May 22, 2017 (the “May Event”).**  
10

11 **A.** On May 22, 2017, Sugar Creek suddenly lost the ability to discharge to WWRSD’s lift  
12 station. Once we discovered the issue, we immediately called WWRSD to inform them of the  
13 problem. We were unable to reach anyone at the plant and were forced to leave a message.  
14 A WWRSD technician came out to our production plant later that day to investigate the  
15 issue. The technician measured the electrical current to the pumps, but to our knowledge did  
16 nothing further to investigate or determine the cause of the failure. We also attempted to  
17 reach directly to the WWRSD Board President twice during the day via email, which are set  
18 forth in Attachment RH-6.

19 Sugar Creek employees including Ed Rodden, Lorie Brengelman and I attended the WWRSD  
20 Board Meeting that evening in order to inform the Board that we were again experiencing  
21 backups and were unable to discharge water. The Board did not offer any explanation for  
22 why we were experiencing these issues and simply stated that WWRSD was doing the best it

1 could to resolve the issue. On May 23, 2017, we brought in 8 Frac Tanks, and we brought in  
2 2 more on May 24, 2017.

3 The next morning, another WWRSD technician came out to our production facility to  
4 investigate the issue. However, WWRSD was unable to determine the cause of the failure  
5 until later that day or possibly the next morning.

6 **Q. What was causing the issue?**

7 A. No one at WWRSD has ever actually communicated to us what caused the May Event  
8 failure. However, based on our own observations and our overhearing of the WWRSD's  
9 technicians' communications, it is our understanding that a miscalculation of some sort  
10 resulted in too much pressure in the lines which caused the lift station pumps to become  
11 unseated. The pumps have since been resealed; however, until someone at WWRSD  
12 communicates to us exactly what caused the May Event to occur, we cannot be sure whether  
13 the issue was ever properly identified and repaired. As far as we are concerned, a failure like  
14 this could happen again at any given moment. Since this statement was given, WWRSD has  
15 installed a diesel powered auxiliary pump to supplement the lift station.

16 **Q. Has WWRSD since provided any information related to the cause of the May Event**  
17 **and actions taken to prevent it from recurring?**

18 A. Again, we asked in discovery. This is Request 1.5. In short, we believe WWRSD does not  
19 yet know what caused the failure.

1 **Q. Their response to discovery again implies that WWRSD is uncertain whether Sugar**  
2 **Creek's flows were within the 200,000 gallons per day in the certificate. What were**  
3 **Sugar Creek's flows at the time?**

4 **A.** On May 21, 2017 our pretreatment facility discharged 50,881 gallons; on May 22, 2017, our  
5 pretreatment facility discharged 151,341 gallons; on May 23, 2017, our pretreatment facility  
6 discharged 79,516 gallons.

7 **Q. What were the estimated flows from all sources (including the pretreatment facility and**  
8 **all other discharges from Sugar Creek) on those days?**

9 **A.** Starting May 23, we were putting water into the Frac Tanks. Before that, we were using our  
10 holding tanks to hold water. Further, and as I described previously with the January event, we  
11 were holding water at various points in the plant. On May 21, the total estimated flow was  
12 73,321; on May 22, it was 200,403; and on May 23, it was 144,462. Only one of these days  
13 was slightly above 200,000 gpd, and the capacity certificate is expressed as an average day.

14 **Q. What costs has Sugar Creek incurred as a result of the WWRSD Service Issues?**

15 **A.** Sugar Creek has incurred approximately \$330,000 in costs as a result of WWRSD's service  
16 issues. These costs include approximately \$112,000 in loss of production for the two shift  
17 period and \$210,000 for the Frac Tank rental to store water on site. These costs do not  
18 include the costs incurred by our approximately 400 employees, who ultimately lost a full  
19 day's work and wages. Documentation supporting these costs is attached as Attachment RH-  
20 7. There are also countless other costs that simply cannot be quantified, such as production  
21 schedule changes, modification of sanitation schedules, executive time, and potential loss of

1 workforce due to employees finding other jobs when they were sent home during the shut  
2 down.

3 **Q. Is Sugar Creek's plant located in an Industrial Park?**

4 **A.** Yes. Sugar Creek's plant is located in the Gateway Industrial Park in Cambridge City,  
5 Indiana.

6 **Q. What impact have WWRSD's capacity issues had on other customers located in the**  
7 **Gateway Industrial Park?**

8 **A.** County officials have indicated to us that it is limiting the County's ability to market the  
9 remaining properties.

10 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

11 **A.** Yes, it does.

> From: Dearman, Victor  
> Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 10:15 PM  
> To: Holbrook, Ronald <[rholbrook@sugar-creek.com](mailto:rholbrook@sugar-creek.com)>; Sileo, Daniel <[Dsileo@sugar-creek.com](mailto:Dsileo@sugar-creek.com)>  
> Cc: Schurig, Thomas <[tschurig@sugar-creek.com](mailto:tschurig@sugar-creek.com)>; Reitzler, Ryan <[RReitzler@sugar-creek.com](mailto:RReitzler@sugar-creek.com)>;  
Hauck, Alex <[AHauck@sugar-creek.com](mailto:AHauck@sugar-creek.com)>; Brengelman, Lorie <[LBrengelman@sugar-creek.com](mailto:LBrengelman@sugar-creek.com)>; Ziegler,  
Nathan <[nziegler@sugar-creek.com](mailto:nziegler@sugar-creek.com)>; Gregory, Scott <[sgregory@sugar-creek.com](mailto:sgregory@sugar-creek.com)>; Gross, Ryan  
<[rgross2@sugar-creek.com](mailto:rgross2@sugar-creek.com)>; Richardson, Michael <[MRichardson@sugar-creek.com](mailto:MRichardson@sugar-creek.com)>; Tamborski, Peter  
<[PTamborski@sugar-creek.com](mailto:PTamborski@sugar-creek.com)>; Clark, Tim <[tclark@sugar-creek.com](mailto:tclark@sugar-creek.com)>  
> Subject: Sanitary Sewer Issue today, 4/14/16  
>  
> All,  
>  
> Today about 12:30 p.m., the guard called me to let me know that Bob Warner (Wayne County Highway Engineer) was in the lobby to see me about Waste Water. He was there to deliver an urgent message that a sanitary manhole on the Southeast corner of the EDC retention pond (off site) had water coming out of it spilling onto the ground. This is directly west of the lift station off the side of S.R. 1 and receives water from our Waste Water Treatment System. This was discovered by a mowing crew who then called Bob so it is not certain how long this has been going on, but he and I drove out to investigate.  
>  
> Upon arriving at the manhole, I had the Utility Tech's stop all flow out of our plant which slowed the rate of spillage considerably. This manhole is also located within 10 feet of a storm drain manhole but did not appear to have reached storm water.  
>  
> At 12:57 I called both Ron Holbrook and Dan Sileo to inform them of the situation and then followed up with Nate Ziegler thereafter.  
>  
> Bob had contacted Joey Pike (Operator at Western Wayne Water District) and a couple of mechanics to look at their lift station. Upon investigation it was determined that both of their lift station pumps were running. Bob Warner initially made a suggestion that the flow generated by our plant was too high for the lift station to handle, so I inquired as to what their capacity was and was told that the pipeline could handle as much as 1 million gallons per day. Bob went on to say that there was some discussion that we had recently increased flow thought to be a result of increased production. I then called our Utility Technicians to see what the current flow for today was. At the time it was 130,000 gallons (approximately) run. This is counted from midnight to midnight. While we have had a peak flow of 217,000 gallons in one day, we typically have been averaging about 130,000 or so per day. I then let Bob and Joey Pike know that the flow rate leaving the plant is usually 150 gallons per minute and we have at times run as high as 200 gpm. If the plant consistently ran 150 gpm, we would deliver 216,000 gallons in a day which is below our commitment. Even though WWWD has copies of our operating records that we submit every month, I offered to show them the treatment plant, current flow rates, and recorded flow rates for the past week or so in an effort to be transparent. Bob and Joey both declined the offer.  
>  
> Bob and Joey then shifted focus to say that it seems that SC tends to process more water during the daylight hours as opposed to spreading the discharge of the plant out over the range of the 24 hours. I

explained that is mostly true due to the difference in flows between production and sanitation hours which is typical for any food processing facility and at any rate we would not and have not exceeded our permit, design criteria, or otherwise but I was more than willing to help find root cause regardless of where it lies. It was at that time that Joey Pike stated that they knew what the issue was or at least thought they did but it would have to be handled by a higher authority. I took this, based upon body language and demeanor to indicate that knowledge of lift stations and pumps that were either in decreased capacity or in need of upgrade to handle the flow from the industrial park.

>

> Bob, Joey, and I followed the pipeline back to the SC property line at the edge of Enterprise Road finding manholes of lower elevations to be full of water and draining slow. Joey and Bob asked me if we could allow the system to catch up for a little bit so long as it did not put us in a bad way. I agreed to do this and stated that I would reduce flow to the extent possible when we started the system back up but that resolution to the issue would need to happen quickly or it could cause us to have to haul water away via trucks which is very costly to SC and that if we could help in any way to let me/us know. We all agreed on the issue, exchanged contact information, and Joey informed me that he was going to contact Darlene (also of WWWD) to let her know of the situation and take the appropriate steps to report the spillage.

>

> During this walk down of the drain system, it was noted by Joey and Bob that the spillways for the retention pond overflow needed addressed as there appeared to be blockages from grass, weeds, etc. and they would have that addressed. Not our issue, but capturing it in conversation.

>

> The flow from our plant has been reduced to about 130 gpm and will keep the outflow pretty constant based upon water usage in the plant. We will from time to time go out to the manhole that was the source of spillage and if there is an issue we will stop flow and contact WWWD and Bob immediately.

>

> I will reach out to Bob, Joey, and Darlene tomorrow to see if they have come to any conclusions and what next steps are to avoid this in the future.

>

> Feel free to contact me with any questions.

>

> Thanks,

> Victor Dearman

> Maintenance Manager

> Work

> 765-312-0210

> Mobile

> 765-312-2218



**From:** Hauck, Alex

**Sent:** Friday, August 05, 2016 9:28 AM

**To:** Hutcheson, Dan <dhutcheson@sugar-creek.com>; Rodden, Edward <ERodden@sugar-creek.com>; Tamborski, Peter <PTamborski@sugar-creek.com>; Brengelman, Lorie <LBrengelman@sugar-creek.com>

**Cc:** Richardson, John <JRichardson@sugar-creek.com>; Richardson, Michael <MRichardson@sugar-creek.com>; Holbrook, Ronald <rhobrook@sugar-creek.com>; Dearman, Victor <Vdearman@sugar-creek.com>; John, Michael <MJohn@sugar-creek.com>

**Subject:** RE: Input from IFA re WWRSD

Regarding the lift station, here is a quick update, which will be followed with an email update from Strand today to include more details.

- We flow out of our system to the lift station at a range of 90-200 GPM, based on hourly inspections of the manhole between our WWTP and the lift station. The manhole represents the low point in the line, and so is a good visual check. In order to send out 200k GPD from our system, we need to average 139 GPM.
- The fluctuation is based on other flows from the industrial park, mainly Taconic. They average 50k GPD, with peak flows between 6-10AM. There may be other factors, we need to tour WWRSD and better understand how the lift station pumps are controlled.
- The rated flow from the lift station downstream is approx. 180-200 GPM. Strand was confused, thinking it should be higher, until they learned that the forced main line is 6" HDPE, which means in inside diameter of only 5", not the 6" ID we previously thought. Derates the flow due to friction losses.
- Because of this, we have essentially two options:
  - o Upgrade the lift station pumps, from 10hp to 72hp (largest pump size to fit in the existing pit), and run a bypass around the next lift station downstream. This will provide approx. 280GPM of flow (400k GPD).
  - o OR, upgrade both lift stations with 60hp pumps → continue to pump from our lift station to the next lift station. This will provide approx. 325 GPM (468k GPD)
- I have asked for cost estimates for both options. The lift station upgrade includes pump replacement, controls, generator upsize, and conversion from 240V single phase to 480V 3 phase. Both will be costly, option 2 higher. And, if end up sending water to Connersville, the plan calls for 72hp pumps. Option 1 would take care of that piece.
- The timing of this will be about 6 months, considering bids, approval, parts delivery and construction. Therefore we need to look at some options, such as an auxiliary pump (rental), to get some additional GPM out right now.
- We are also going to run a camera through the line to make sure there is not significant grease buildup in the line, from RCF days.

Bottom line, our system could be pushing more water out, but we can only push out what the lift station can take away. Ed will talk with WWRSD about these options, more to come. High priority.

www.btlaw.com

ATLANTA CHICAGO DALLAS DELAWARE INDIANA  
LOS ANGELES MICHIGAN MINNEAPOLIS OHIO WASHINGTON, D.C.

**From:** Brengelman, Lorie [<mailto:LBrengelman@sugar-creek.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 28, 2017 1:47 PM

**To:** Kile, Nicholas; Tamborski, Peter; Rodden, Edward

**Subject:** RE: Sugar Creek draft letter to Keith Beall

FYI: I checked the daily water reports and wastewater reports for May 21-23. Our wastewater discharge totals on the days leading up to the pump failure are not bad, but our incoming water gallons is quite high.

|           | Incoming Water (gal) | Wastewater System Discharge (gal) |
|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 5/21/2017 | 103,380              | 39,200                            |
| 5/22/2017 | 276,110              | 139,300                           |
| 5/23/2017 | 375,880              | 67,200 (shut down most day)       |

**Lorie Brengelman**  
Director, Environmental  
Work 513-551-5280 x5326  
Mobile 513-785-8320

SugarCreek  
4360 Creek Road  
Cincinnati, OH 45241  
[SugarCreek.com](http://SugarCreek.com)



**From:** Kile, Nicholas [<mailto:Nicholas.Kile@btlaw.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 28, 2017 1:00 PM

**To:** Tamborski, Peter <[PTamborski@sugar-creek.com](mailto:PTamborski@sugar-creek.com)>; Rodden, Edward <[ERodden@sugar-creek.com](mailto:ERodden@sugar-creek.com)>; Brengelman, Lorie <[LBrengelman@sugar-creek.com](mailto:LBrengelman@sugar-creek.com)>

**Subject:** FW: Sugar Creek draft letter to Keith Beall

Here is the draft.

[VCard](#) [Bio](#) [Dept Info](#)

**BARNES &  
THORNBURG LLP**

**Nicholas K. Kile**  
Partner  
[nicholas.kile@btlaw.com](mailto:nicholas.kile@btlaw.com)

Barnes & Thornburg LLP  
11 South Meridian Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-3535 USA

Phone: (317) 231-7768

Fax: (317) 231-7433  
www.btlaw.com

ATLANTA CHICAGO DALLAS DELAWARE INDIANA  
LOS ANGELES MICHIGAN MINNEAPOLIS OHIO WASHINGTON, D.C.

---

**From:** Cloud, Judy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 28, 2017 12:58 PM  
**To:** Kile, Nicholas  
**Subject:** Sugar Creek draft letter to Keith Beall

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return email and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return email and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

## Waste Water Issues

### Beginning 5/22/17

#### 5/22/17

- At 5:55, Scott Gregory reports to Victor Dearman that the manhole is overflowing on to the ground.
- Victor advises Scott to contact WWRSD to inform them of both the overflow as well as to advise that the lift station has a high level alarm.
- Darlene stated that she wished she had known earlier as she was about to attend a board meeting. However, "they were doing everything they could and would check the lift stations". Scott asked Darlene to call him back and let him know what was found. No call from Darlene was received.
- At 7:01 p.m. Ron Holbrook indicates by text that Darlene says both lift stations are working properly.
- At 7:28 p.m., the water level in the manhole had dropped 2 feet. The pre-treatment system restarted and flow reduced to minimize the risk of overflowing again.
- At 7:53, Ron Holbrook indicates by text that John Turpin said both lift stations are working properly.
- At 7:55, we discuss through text that the total volume discharged through the pre-treatment plant is 114,400 gallons which is below normal. Typical volume would be approximately 100,000 gallons by noon.
- At 9:56 p.m., the manhole is down 5 foot and the pre-treatment system is started. At this time, our EQ tank was at 47%.

#### 5/23/17

- 7:45 a.m., Scott Gregory has the pre-treatment system shut back down as the manhole was beginning to flood. At the time, the flow rate was 120 gpm. EQ tank at 76%, MBBR at 90%.
- At 8:00 a.m., Victor Dearman reports that John Turpin is arriving at the north lift station.
- John Turpin asks us to stop or greatly reduce flow so he can "draw down" the lift station by pumping out as much water as possible.
- At 10:16 a.m. the level in the lift station was down approximately 6 feet from where we started at a high level.
- At 10:30 a.m., John Turpin acknowledges the lift station is draining very slowly.
- At 10:44 a.m., Darlene shows up at the north lift station. Avoids direct contact with Scott and I all together. Only speaks with John Turpin.
- At 10:47 a.m., John Turpin leaves the lift station stating that we would let the pumps run for a while to see if they would catch up.
- At 12:57 p.m., John Turpin returns and the water level is down another 3 feet.
- At 3:43 p.m., a decision is made by SCPC to order 4 frac tanks in anticipation that the waste water woes will continue.

- At 7:06 p.m., the lift station was able to be drained with assistance from a vac truck. When the pumps were exposed, they were noticeably out of their seat and water bypassing the discharge line of the pumps which explained the low flow from the pumps.
- John Turpin does not feel comfortable lifting the pumps out due to warranty issues and makes a call to the pump manufacturer.
- The lift station is buttoned up and returned to automatic operation. SCPC restarts the pre-treatment system at 100 gpm.
- WWRSD and John Turpin leaves for the evening.
- At 8:29 p.m., Victor orders 4 more frac tanks. Giving the plant 8.
- At 8:39 p.m., the EQ tank is at 95%, MBBR at 95% and calamity at 25%.
- At 9:51 p.m., John Turpin calls Victor Dearman to inform that he needs all flow stopped again by 7:00 a.m. Wednesday the 24<sup>th</sup> at which point he will draw the lift station down again with assistance from a vac truck. The pump manufacturer will be there at 10:00 a.m. to inspect the pump conditions.
- During the course of the night, 3 frac tanks are filled.

#### 5/24/17

- 6:00 a.m., Scott has the pre-treatment system shut down in anticipation of the upcoming lift station work.
- 7:00 a.m., work begins on the lift station draw down.
- 9:45 a.m., the pump manufacturer arrives and inspects the pumps.
- The pumps are picked up and re-seated into position.
- At 10:00 a.m., Marty Wesler arrives.
- Much discussion takes place as to why the pumps would unseat like that.
- Speculation is that a pressure reading needs to be taken on the discharge line of the pumps to determine how many feet of head the pumps are pushing against. Pump manufacturer is speculating that the pumps are not delivering full capacity due to wrong information about the total head on the discharge of the pumps leading to ordering the wrong pump...
- John Turpin states that the pumps were pulled after the initial installation on 2/7/17, to look at a potential issue at which point a piece of wood was found in one of the pumps. In removing the pumps, a gasket was torn and a temporary gasket installed with the intent of the proper gasket being ordered and installed upon arrival. That never happened and nobody had a gasket to install this time.
- At 11:00 a.m., the pre-treatment system is restarted as Wesler and the pump manufacturer want to see the incoming flow.
- At 12:30, Scott and Victor notice that the pump discharge check valves weights have been moved in position. Assumption is to reduce pressure on the discharge side of the pumps to allow more flow.
- At 1:00 p.m., the lift station is returned to operation with anticipation that the pump manufacturer and Wesler Engineering will provide a solution. Victor and Scott inquire as to the reliability of the pumps in present condition to perform to what SCPC needs in order to be able to discharge effectively.

- At 2:44 p.m., Scott reports that the manhole is already full and the pre-treatment process stopped.
- At 5:04 p.m., after consulting with Ron Holbrook, 2 more frac tanks were ordered to give us a total of 10 tanks.
- At approximately 7:00 p.m., the pre-treatment system is re-started. Manhole level is down by 6 feet.
- At 7:47 p.m., the manhole is down 8 feet and flow increased to 170 gpm.
- At 8:39 p.m., level is holding and flow increased to 200 gpm.
- At 10:13 p.m., the manhole level increased to 5.5 feet but flow remained the same.

#### 5/25/17

- At 12:03 a.m., the manhole level was 2.5 feet from top and flow reduced to 125.
- At 1:48 a.m., still 2.5 feet and flow of 125 gpm.
- At 3:00 a.m., level dropped to 4 feet. Flow increased to 140 gpm.
- At 4:41 a.m., the level dropped to 5.5 feet and increased flow to 170 gpm.
- At 6:00 a.m., level at 5 feet, flow increased to 190 gpm.
- At 7:46 a.m., Ron Holbrook states that the Capitol Hill lift station high level light is flashing.
- At 9:00 a.m., the manhole is full and the pre-treatment system is shut down.
- At 9:58 a.m., the manhole dropped to 2 feet and the system was started up at 100 gpm.
- At 10:49, the manhole level dropped to 4 feet and flow increased.
- At 1:23 p.m., the manhole was full and flow reduced to 125 gpm.
- At 2:28 p.m., the manhole was starting to flood and the pre-treatment system shut down.
- EQ Tank at 74%, MBBR full. Calamity empty.
- At 3:14 p.m., the manhole was still full.
- At 5:11 p.m., the manhole level dropped to 4.5 feet. The pre-treatment system started and flow rate set to 150 gpm.
- At 6:05 p.m., Ron Holbrook indicates that Darlene, John Turpin, and another guy were at the Capitol Hill lift station. High level light is on.
- At 6:47 p.m., John Turpin shuts off one pump at the north lift station to give the Capitol Hill lift station a chance to catch up.
- At 7:13 p.m., our discharge rate was at 150 gpm.
- At 8:04 p.m., the manhole is at 4 feet and rate of 160 gpm.
- At 9:16 p.m., the manhole maintains level and flow is increased to 180 gpm.

#### 5/26/17

- At 5 a.m., the manhole was full and system stopped.
- At 6:55 a.m., the manhole was near empty and the system started.
- At 8:59 a.m., John Turpin again shuts one of the north lift station pumps down to allow the Capitol Hill Lift station to catch up.
- At 9:11 a.m., the manhole is at 6 feet and system running 160 gpm.
- At 9:59, Scott calls WWRSD to inquire as to the status of the lift stations and pumps. No answer.
- At 10:42 a.m., the manhole is 2.5 feet. Flow rate at 150 gpm.
- At 1:15 p.m., the manhole is full and system stopped.

- Victor calls WWRSD. Joey Pike answers. Victor inquires as to the status of the lift stations and pumps and informs Joey that we are shut down again. Joey defers all questions to Darlene who is not onsite. Says he will leave her a message that I called with this information/questions.
- At 2:33, the manhole is 4 feet down and system started with a flow rate of 100 gpm.

#### 5/27/17

- At 9:29 a.m., manhole is 3 feet. Flow is 150 gpm.
- Frac tanks are being emptied into the system with no production happening this weekend.
- About 10:00 a.m., the plant is shut down for 2 hours for a compressed air tie in.
- At 12:27 p.m., the manhole is 5 feet, flow is 180 gpm.
- At 1:31 p.m., the manhole is empty. Flow is 200 gpm.
- At 2:56 p.m., the manhole is 5.5 feet. Flow is 200 gpm.
- At 4:45 p.m., the manhole is 4 feet. Flow is 200 gpm. 2 Frac tanks left to empty.
- At 8:00 p.m., the manhole is 4 feet. Flow is 200 gpm.
- At 10:52 p.m., the manhole is 4.5 feet. Flow is 200 gpm.

#### 5/28/17

- At 1:00 a.m., the manhole is 2 feet. Flow is reduced to 120 gpm.
- At 2:58 a.m., the manhole is 6 feet. Flow is up to 180 gpm.
- At 5:02 a.m., the manhole is 8 feet. Flow is up to 210 gpm.
- At 7:23 a.m., John Turpin texts Victor saying that he has a tentative plan to change a seal/gasket in one of the North lift station pumps on Monday the 29<sup>th</sup>. Wants to know if we would have a problem diverting flow while this takes place. He's planning on 9:00 a.m. Victor responds that it will not be a problem and thanks for the heads up.
- At 9:01 a.m., the manhole is empty. Flow is 200. All frac tanks empty.
- System shuts down on low water shortly after.
- At 2:16 p.m., John texts Victor to let us know that he is finished and everything is back in auto. Victor asks what would cause the seals to fail within 4 months. John states that he is just being proactive.

#### 5/29/17

- The only recorded flow is around 4:00 p.m.

#### 5/30/17

- System starts discharging water at approximately 3:00 a.m.
- At 4:58 a.m., the manhole is 9 feet. Flow is 200 gpm.
- At 8:22 a.m., manhole at 7.5 feet.
- 10:32 a.m., manhole at 6 feet.
- 12:35 p.m., WWTP is caught up and shut down.
- At 3:42 p.m., although the system is down, the manhole is checked and is empty.
- The system starts back up and discharging water at approximately 6:00 p.m.
- At 7:28 p.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow is 200 gpm.
- At 10:08 p.m., manhole holding at 9 feet.

- System back down at about midnight due to low water.

**5/31/17**

- At 12:15 a.m., manhole holding at 9 feet.
- At 2:27 a.m., manhole empty.
- System starts discharging water at approximately 3:00 a.m.
- At 5:19 a.m., the manhole is empty.
- Manhole at 8 feet at 7:36 a.m. Flow at 180 gpm.
- At 9:24 a.m., manhole at 2 feet. Flow slowed to 130 gpm. Just over 80,000 gallons discharged since midnight.
- 9:29 a.m., Victor sends John Turpin a text letting him know that the manhole is 2 feet from top and that we're slowing flow. Also that we only discharged about 75,000 gallons total on the 30<sup>th</sup> and 80,000 since midnight today (average of 140 gpm). John indicates that he is working another job today and to contact WWRSD.
- 9:31 a.m., Victor calls WWRSD twice, both times getting voicemail.
- At 10:50 a.m., manhole is still 2 feet. Flow at 120 gpm.
- At 11:58 a.m., manhole is 4 feet from the top. Flow raised to 130gpm.
- At 1:29 p.m., manhole is 4 feet, raised flow to 140 gpm.
- At 2:49 p.m., manhole at 3.5 feet. Flow increased to 145 gpm.
- At 4:58 p.m., manhole at 2.5 feet. Rate maintained at 145 gpm
- At 7:24 p.m., manhole is 4 feet. Rate maintained at 145 gpm
- At 9:19 p.m., manhole is 6 feet. Rate increased to 165 gpm
- At 9:41 p.m., manhole is 10 feet. Rate maintained at 165 gpm

**6/1/17**

- At 12:12 a.m., manhole at 12 feet. Rate increased to 200gpm
- At 2:13 a.m., manhole at 12 feet. Rate set at 195 gpm
- At 4:29 a.m., manhole at 12 feet. Rate is 190 gpm
- At 7:30 a.m., rate is 190 gpm
- At 8:17 a.m., manhole at 5'. Rate 190gpm
- At 11:25 a.m., manhole at 8" rate reduced to 150gpm
- At 11:41 a.m., reduced rate to 115gpm to ensure manhole integrity
- At 12:00 p.m., reduced rate to 0gpm (DAF 3 turned off) to ensure manhole integrity



- At 12:11 p.m., I contacted Darlene Druley, WWRSD Superintendent, I informed her that the manhole level had risen sharply over the last couple hours and that due to that we had first reduced our rate and eventually shut down our pre-treatment system discharge to maintain manhole integrity. She advised she was not aware there was any issue, but she would investigate. She also advised that at 9:30 the high level light at the North (Industrial Park) lift station was not on. I informed her we did not check the alarm light, when the manhole level gets that high experience has told us that the lift station is high, or about to be, as well. She said thank you for letting her know as she was not interested in having to report a manhole being flooded and I agreed we did not as well. She indicated she had not looked at the status today as yet and would be doing so.
- At 1:48 p.m., manhole at 6 feet. DAF 3 discharge back on at 140gpm
- At 3:12 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow increased to 160gpm
- At 5:00 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow increased to 180gpm
- At 8:18 p.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow increased to 200gpm

#### 6/2/17

- At 2:26 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow maintained at 200gpm
- At 4:49a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow maintained at 200gpm
- At 7:12a.m., manhole 5.5 feet. Flow maintained at 200gpm
- At 9:20 a.m., manhole at 1 foot. DAF 3 discharge shut down to preserve manhole integrity
- At 10:30 a.m., manhole at 4.5 feet. Discharge resumed at 145gpm
- At 12:31 p.m., manhole at 5.5 feet. Flow increased to 160gpm
- At 2:31 p.m., manhole empty. Flow increased to 200gpm
- At 4:24 p.m., manhole clear to the bottom. Flow maintained 200gpm

#### 6/3/17

- At 12:41 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow maintained at 200gpm
- At 2:41 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow maintained at 200 gpm
- At 4:40 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow maintained at 200gpm
- At 7:19 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow reduced to 190gpm to provide longer retention time in MBBR
- At 8:46 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow maintained at 190gpm
- At 10:18 a.m., manhole empty. Flow at 180gpm to facilitate retention time in the MBBR
- At 1:26 p.m., WWTP down on levels
- At 8:03 p.m., manhole 9.5 feet. Flow at 180gpm
- At 10:03 p.m., manhole empty. Down on levels

**6/4/17**

- At 12:30 a.m., manhole empty. Flow at 200gpm
- At 2:58 a.m., manhole empty. Flow at 200gpm
- At 5:29 a.m., manhole at 8 feet. Flow at 200gpm

**6/5/17**

- At 7:08 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 7:39 p.m., manhole at 8.5 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 10:03 p.m., manhole at 9 feet. System off on levels

**6/6/17**

- At 1:39 a.m., manhole empty. Flow at 200gpm
- At 3:44 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 8:46 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 11:18 a.m., manhole at 1 foot. Shut discharge off to maintain manhole integrity.
- At 2:20 p.m., manhole at 8.5 feet. Starting to discharge at 200gpm
- At 5:18 p.m., manhole empty. Flow at 200gpm
- At 9:45 p.m., manhole at 6 feet. Flow at 200gpm

**6/7/17**

- At 2:34 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 4:13 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 7:55 a.m., manhole at 8 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 9:47 a.m., manhole at 3 feet. Flow slowed to 160gpm to preserve manhole integrity.
- At 10:51 a.m., manhole at 1 foot. Flow reduced to 100gpm
- At 11:03 a.m., due to manhole integrity concerns, discharge stopped
- At 1:24 p.m., manhole at 8.5 feet. Discharge rate set to 200gpm
- At 3:15 p.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 7:03 p.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 11:05 p.m., manhole 9 feet. Discharge at 0gpm due to MBBR being at minimum level

**6/8/17**

- At 3:09 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 5:00 a.m., manhole at 8 feet. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 7:31 a.m., manhole at 5 feet. Reduced rate to 180gpm to preserve manhole integrity
- At 9:22 a.m., manhole at 3 feet. Reduced rate to 140gpm to preserve manhole integrity
- At 10:22 a.m., manhole at 2 feet. Reduced rate to 120gpm
- At 11:47 a.m., manhole at 3 feet. Maintained rate at 120gpm
- At 1:16 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate to 130gpm

- At 2:59 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate to 140gpm
- At 4:22 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate raised to 150gpm
- At 5:37 p.m., manhole at 6 feet. Flow increased to 175gpm
- At 8:02 p.m., manhole at 7.5 feet. Flow maintained at 175gpm
- At 10:20 p.m., manhole empty. Discharge at 0gpm due to MBBR being at minimum level

**6/9/17**

- At 4:35 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate at 200gpm
- At 7:40 a.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 175gpm
- At 9:03 a.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate maintained
- At 10:41 a.m., manhole at 3 feet. Flow reduced to 160gpm to maintain manhole integrity
- At 12:45 p.m., manhole is at 2 feet. Flow reduced to 120gpm to maintain manhole integrity
- At 2:34 p.m., manhole is at 3 feet. Flow maintained at 120gpm to ensure manhole integrity
- At 4:28 p.m., manhole is at 3 feet. Flow increased to 130gpm.
- At 5:38 p.m., manhole is empty. Flow increased to 200gpm
- At 7:54 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 195gpm
- At 10:30 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 195gpm

**6/10/17**

- At 12:42 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 9:35 a.m., manhole at 6.5 feet. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 12:12 p.m., system down of levels.

**6/11/17**

- At 8:30 a.m., manhole empty. Flow 200gpm

**6/12/17**

- At 1:19 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow at 200gpm
- At 8:55 a.m., manhole empty. Flow 200gpm
- At 1:06 p.m., System down on levels

**6/13/17**

- At 2:44 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow 200gpm
- At 4:54 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow 200gpm
- At 7:47 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow 190 gpm
- At 9:19 a.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow reduced to 165gpm to preserve manhole integrity
- At 11:15 a.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow maintained 165gpm
- At 1:27 p.m., manhole at 3 feet. Flow maintained at 165gpm

- At 8:25 p.m., manhole at the bottom. System had been down on levels and is just about to start up
- At 10:48 p.m., manhole at the bottom. Flow rate 200gpm

#### 6/14/17

- At 1:25 a.m., manhole at the bottom. System down on levels
- At 3:45 a.m., manhole at the bottom. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 6:45 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 7:06 a.m., given previous manhole level, rate reduced to 185gpm
- At 8:04 a.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate reduced to 170gpm
- At 9:24 a.m., manhole at 3'3". Flow rate maintained at 170gpm
- At 10:48 a.m., manhole at 1 foot. Shut DAF 3 discharge off to maintain manhole integrity.
- At 12:26 p.m., manhole at 6 feet. Resumed discharge at 140gpm
- At 2:26 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow increased to 165gpm
- At 4:16 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow maintained at 165gpm
- AT 6:30 p.m., manhole at 5.5 feet. Flow maintained at 165gpm

#### 6/15/17

- At 1:28 a.m., manhole empty. System down on levels
- At 3:32 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate at 200gpm
- At 8:23 a.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate reduced to 140gpm to preserve manhole integrity
- At 9:51 a.m., manhole at 3.3 feet. Flow rate reduced to 130gpm to preserve manhole integrity
- AT 12:03 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate maintained at 130gpm to preserve manhole integrity
- At 1:47 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate increased to 140gpm
- At 5:05 p.m., after noticing a great deal of traffic at the North Lift Station, Victor Dearman, Jim Davis, and Scott Gregory went to investigate. We encountered John Turpin (Turpin Electric), and two gentlemen from Xylem Indianapolis. They had set up a diesel driven (Godwin) pump package and a 500 gallon diesel supply tank with suction and discharge lines from the lift station to the discharge check valve vault adjacent to the lift station. The only communication we were able to get was that this was insurance in case there was a problem with the lift station pumps.
- At 5:30 p.m., manhole at 5.5 feet. Flow increased to 165gpm
- At 7:07 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow increased to 200gpm
- At 8:53 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. System down on levels

#### 6/16/17

- At 2:27 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow set at 200gpm
- At 3:45 a.m., manhole at 7.5 feet. Flow 200gpm
- At 5:20 a.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 200gpm
- At 8:07 a.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate 200gpm

- At 10:02 a.m., manhole at 6.5 feet. Flow adjusted to 215gpm. Diesel auxiliary pump running at lift station.
- At 11:53 a.m., manhole at 8.5 feet. Flow rate 215gpm. Diesel pump running at lift station.
- At 1:32 p.m., manhole empty. Discharge from plant off due to high level in sludge holding tank 2101.
- At 3:58 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 215gpm. Diesel pump not running at lift station.
- At 9:40 p.m., manhole at 9 feet. System down on levels

#### 6/17/17

- At 3:17 a.m., manhole is at 9 feet. Flow rate 215gpm
- At 5:06 a.m., manhole is 7 feet. Flow rate 215gpm
- At 7:28 a.m., manhole is at 4 feet. Flow rate at 215gpm. Diesel pump running
- At 9:59 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate at 215gpm. Diesel pump off
- At 11:30 a.m., System down on levels

#### 6/18/17

- Minimal flow during the day on Sunday

#### 6/19/17

- At 4:44 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate at 215gpm
- At 7:27 a.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate 215gpm. Diesel pump running
- At 8:22 a.m., system down on levels
- At 2:56 p.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 215gpm.

#### 6/20/17

- At 5:41 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 215gpm
- At 7:31 a.m., manhole 5.5 feet. Flow rate 215gpm Diesel pump not running
- At 9:08 a.m., manhole 4.5 feet. Flow rate 215gpm. Diesel pump running
- At 10:44 a.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 215gpm. Diesel pump running
- At 5:24 p.m., manhole 8.5 feet. Flow rate at 215gpm. Diesel off
- AT 8:28 p.m., manhole at 4.5 feet. System down on levels. Diesel off

#### 6/21/17

- At 12:45 a.m., manhole empty. System down on levels
- AT 3:29 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate at 215gpm.
- AT 5:00 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate at 215gpm
- At 7:50 a.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate at 215gpm. Diesel pump is running
- At 12:45 p.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 215gpm. Diesel pump running

- At 2:29 p.m., per direction from Mr. Holbrook, discharge rate was reduced to 145gpm.
- At 5:45 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow rate maintained at 145gpm
- At 8:45 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate maintained 145gpm
- At 10:35 p.m., manhole empty. System down of levels.

**6/22/17**

- At 2:09 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 3:26 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 5:46 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 8:42 a.m., manhole 7.5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 11:37 a.m., manhole 6.5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 2:06 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:32 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:36 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:50 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm

**6/23/17**

- At 1:33 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:28 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:47 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 10:09 a.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:17 p.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm

**6/24/17**

- At 3:27 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:48 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 10:28 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 12:44 p.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm

**6/25/17**

- No manhole checks documented

**6/26/17**

- At 1:55 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:26 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 8:15 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:45 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 5:13 p.m., manhole at 6 feet. Flow rate 145gpm

**6/27/17**

- At 7:51 a.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 10:24 a.m., manhole at 6 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 12:39 p.m., manhole at 4 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 3:41 p.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm and diesel pump running.
- At 7:43 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:26 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm

**6/28/17**

- At 8:02 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 1:42 p.m., manhole at 6 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 3:52 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate at 145gpm
- At 6:53 p.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate at 145gpm
- At 8:58 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm

**6/29/17**

- At 3:57 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 11:56 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 1:43 p.m., manhole at 6.5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:22 p.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:05 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145 gpm
- At 11:07 p.m., manhole empty. System down on levels

**6/30/17**

- At 1:31 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 3:21 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 5:55 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:34 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:43 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145 gpm
- AT 12:30 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 3:19 p.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm

**7/1/17**

- At 1:22 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:05 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 5:37 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:18 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm

7/2/17

- System down on levels

7/3/17

- At 4:29 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 8:04 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 10:40 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 1:21 p.m., manhole empty. System down on levels
- At 3:39 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:20 p.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 145gpm

7/4/17

- At 8:59 a.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 145gpm, diesel pump running

7/5/17

- At 4:07 a.m., manhole 7'6". Flow rate 145gpm
- At 7:35 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:51 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 11:58 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 9:53 p.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 145gpm

7/6/17

- At 12:41 a.m., manhole empty. System down on levels
- At 3:37 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 5:51 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 8:25 a.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 1:43 p.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 145gpm
- At 4:05 p.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 185fpm
- At 7:11 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:06 p.m., manhole 5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 11:01 p.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm

7/7/17

- At 4:24 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 8:31 a.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 12:43 p.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 3:08 p.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 6:59 p.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 185gpm



- AT 9:03p.m., manhole at 5 feet. System down on levels

#### 7/8/17

- At 4:45 a.m., manhole at 5 feet. Flow rate at 185gpm
- At 8:36 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 12:58 p.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 185gpm and diesel pump running
- At 5:08 p.m., manhole 8.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 8:28 p.m., manhole 7.5 feet. System down on levels
- At 11:42 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm

#### 7/9/17

- At 3:47 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- AT 8:20 a.m., manhole 7.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 3:40 p.m., manhole is 9 feet. System down on levels

#### 7/10/17

- At 2:05 a.m., manhole empty. System down for cleaning
- At 4:22 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 8:52 a.m., manhole 8.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm and diesel pump running
- At 2:36 p.m., manhole at 9 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:09 p.m., manhole at 8 feet. Flow rate 185gpm

#### 7/11/17

- At 1:14 a.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 4:17 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 8:02 a.m., manhole at 7 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 12:02 p.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 3:59 p.m., manhole empty. System down on levels
- At 8:52 p.m., manhole 8 feet. System down on levels

#### 7/12/17

- At 4:05 a.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 5:39 p.m., manhole empty. System down on levels
- At 7:07 p.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:34 p.m., manhole 6 feet. System down on levels

**7/13/17**

- At 8:32 a.m., manhole at 8 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 11:53 a.m., manhole 8 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 2:57 p.m., manhole 5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm and diesel pump running
- At 5:45 p.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:43 p.m., manhole 5 feet. System just shut down for levels

**7/14/17**

- At 2:13 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 4:27 a.m., manhole 4.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 8:21 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 11:40 a.m., manhole 7 feet. Flow rate 185gpm and diesel pump running
- At 2:47 p.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 10:52 p.m., manhole 6.5 feet. System just shut down on levels

**7/15/17**

- At 2:29 a.m., manhole 7.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 4:59 a.m., manhole 4.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:35 a.m., manhole 9 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 1:10 p.m., manhole 8.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 3:08 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 7:01 p.m., manhole at 7 feet. System down on levels

**7/16/17**

- At 5:34 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:13 a.m., manhole 6 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 9:04 p.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm

**7/17/17**

- At 10:09 a.m., manhole empty. Flow rate 185gpm
- At 2:28 p.m., manhole 5.5 feet. Flow rate 185gpm
-



**STATE OF INDIANA**

**INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

|                                       |   |                        |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>COMPLAINT OF SUGAR CREEK</b>       | ) |                        |
| <b>PACKING CO. FOR REVIEW OF</b>      | ) |                        |
| <b>WESTERN WAYNE REGIONAL</b>         | ) |                        |
| <b>SEWAGE DISTRICT'S OPERATIONS</b>   | ) |                        |
| <b>PURSUANT TO IC § 8-1-30(3)(b).</b> | ) |                        |
|                                       | ) | <b>CAUSE NO. 44948</b> |
|                                       | ) |                        |
| <b>RESPONDENT: WESTERN WAYNE</b>      | ) |                        |
| <b>REGIONAL SEWAGE DISTRICT</b>       | ) |                        |

**WESTERN WAYNE REGIONAL SEWER DISTRICT'S RESPONSES TO  
SUGAR CREEK'S FIRST SET OF DATA REQUESTS**

Comes now Respondent Western Wayne Regional Sewage District ("WWRSD"), pursuant to 170 IAC 1-1.1-16, and the discovery provisions under Rule 26 through 37 inclusive of the Indiana Rules of Trial Procedure, by counsel, and herein submits by agreement of the parties the following Responses to Sugar Creek Packing Co. ("Sugar Creek" or "Complainant"), First Set of Discovery Requests transmitted herein by e-mail.

**I. Notes and General Objections**

1. The Responses provided to each of the Requests have been prepared pursuant to a reasonable and diligent investigation and search conducted in connection with each of the Requests in areas where responsive information is expected to be located. To the extent the Requests seek or purport to seek information required from a more than reasonable and diligent investigation, WWRSD objects on the grounds that the Request includes an undue burden and unreasonable expense. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or documents which are not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding and which are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

2. WWRSD objects on the grounds and to the extent that the Requests seek electronically stored information, analysis, calculations, or compilations that have not already been performed, are not in a format other than that which WWRSD normally keeps such information, or are from sources that are not reasonably accessible and create an undue burden or cost.

3. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent that they are vague and ambiguous and provide no basis from which WWRSD can decipher or determine what information is sought.

4. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent that they seek or purport to seek information that is subject to the attorney-client, work product, settlement negotiation, or other applicable privileges.

5. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent that the information sought is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is already in the possession of the requestor, is obtainable from a public source or other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive.

6. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent that the burden or expense of providing the proposed response outweighs its likely benefit, taking into account the needs of the case, the parties' respective resources, the amount in controversy between them, the importance of the issues at stake in the litigation between them, and the importance of the proposed information sought in resolving any of the issues.

7. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent they seek documents or information which is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding and to the extent they are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

8. The responses provided to the Requests set forth the information in reasonably complete detail. To the extent that the requesting party contends that a Request calls for more detail, WWRSD objects to the Request on the grounds that it is overly broad, seeks to impose an undue burden and unreasonable expense, and exceeds the scope of permissible discovery.

9. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent that they seek production of documents created during an unreasonably long or unlimited period, on the grounds that the Requests are overly broad, seek to impose an undue burden and unreasonable expense, and exceed the scope of permissible discovery.

10. WWRSD objects to the Requests to the extent they request the production of information and documents not presently in WWRSD's possession, custody or control.

11. WWRSD object to the Requests to the extent they request the production of (a) multiple copies of the same document; (b) additional copies of the same document merely because of immaterial or irrelevant differences; and (c) copies of the same information in multiple formats on the grounds that such Requests are irrelevant, overbroad, unreasonably burdensome, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, not required by the Commission rules, and inconsistent with practice in Commission proceedings.

12. The responses that may be provided are the responses from the business entity involved and have been gathered from a variety of sources. WWRSD objects to the extent any of the requests seek identification of and personal information about persons who may have assisted in the collection of information or otherwise participated in responding to the Requests on the grounds that such Request is overbroad and unreasonably burdensome given the nature and scope of the Request and the potential that there are numerous people who may have been consulted during the diligent investigation to respond to the Request.

13. WWRSD assumes no obligation to supplement the responses except to the extent required under Ind. Trial Rule 26(E)(1) and (2).

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Keith L. Beall

Keith L. Beall (IN Atty #11907-49)  
Beall & Beall  
13238 Snow Owl Dr., Ste. A  
Carmel, IN 46033

Anne Hensley Poindexter  
ALTMAN, POINDEXTER & WYATT LLC  
90 Executive Dr., Suite G  
Carmel, IN 46032

Attorneys for WWRSD

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Western Wayne Regional Sewer District's *Responses to Sugar Creek First Set of Data Requests* was delivered to the following counsel of record via electronic delivery and service:

**SUGAR CREEK PACKING, CO.**

Nicholas K. Kile (#15203-53)

Lauren M. Box (#32521-49)

**BARNES & THORNBURG LLP**

11 South Meridian Street

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Mr. Kile: (317) 231-7768

Ms. Box: (317)231-7289

[Nicholas.Kile@btlaw.com](mailto:Nicholas.Kile@btlaw.com)

[Lauren.Box@btlaw.com](mailto:Lauren.Box@btlaw.com)

/s/ Keith L. Beall



## **II. Data Request Responses.**

**Without waiving any of the foregoing above noted general objections, WWRSD provides the following specific objections and in the spirit of cooperating with the informal discovery process responses.**

**Request 1.1** Please provide WWRSD's Discharge Monitoring Reports and Monthly Reports of Operations for the past twenty-four (24) months.

**Response:** Without waiving any of the above noted objections, please see attached Discharge Monitoring Reports and Monthly Reports provided on the enclosed DVD in separate files marked as WWRSD DR Response Exhibits #1.1 (a) through (y), inclusive.

**Request 1.2** What analysis was undertaken upon which Waunalea Dungan relied before she signed the Capacity Certification/Allocation letter attached hereto?

**Response:** In addition to the general objections set forth above, Respondent specifically objects to this Request to the extent it seeks analysis, calculation, compilation, or study which has not already been performed, memorialized in writing, to which Respondent objects to now having to perform. Respondent additionally objects to providing redundant information already in the possession of Sugar Creek which was created or provided by Sugar Creek originally. Without waiving any of the previously stated objections and in the spirit of cooperating in the discovery process, WWRSD provides the following response:

The WWRSD consulting engineers generally pursued a three (3) step evaluation process, which included a review of the following information, and then verbally shared this evaluation with WWRSD and Waunalea Dungan before the Sugar Creek Capacity Certification Letter was signed, which process generally included the following:

- 1) Primarily reviewed and relied upon the discharge flow information provided by Sugar Creek, including, but not limited to:
  - a. November 5, 2014 Review Meeting Handout from Sugar Creek with its PWWTP Design Information shown as: *200,000 gpd*;
  - b. a December 23, 2014 email from Sugar Creek General Counsel Peter E. Tamborski, Esq. to WWRSD which included a chart from Sugar Creek Corporate Environmental Director Lorie Brengelman setting forth details regarding Sugar Creek's initial start-up and also full operational maximum flows of *200,000 gpd*;
  - c. a subsequent confirmation email exchange from Sugar Creek's Nate Zigler with IDEM representatives dated January 22, 2015 (provided below);
  - d. These same Sugar Creek identified flows were also subsequently verified by Sugar Creek and set forth in the March 9, 2015 IDEM Construction Permit (PDF page 9, page 29, and page 54):

II. Design Data

A. Flow

1. Peak: 400 gpm, 60 minute peak interval, occurring during sanitation operations
2. Daily Maximum: 200,000 GPD (Potentially 300,000 GPD with future expansion)
3. Daily Average: 167 gpm (200,000 gpd) based on 20 hours/day operation

## 2.0 DESIGN DATA

### A. Design Flow:

1. Peak: 400 GPM, 60 minute peak intervals, occurring during sanitation operations
2. Daily Maximum: 200,000 GPD (Potentially to 300,000 GPD with future expansion.)
3. Daily Average: 167 GPM (240,480 gpd)

## 3.0 PROPOSED TREATMENT

While the average wastewater discharge from the facility is expected to range from 150-180 gpm, the wastewater pretreatment system has been designed to accommodate peak flows of up to 400 gpm before the Storage Tank (aka EQ Tank) that could occur during cleaning activities. Additional information is contained in the Drawings and Equipment sections of the application in Appendix C.

---

**From:** WORLEY, DON [mailto:DWORLEY@idem.IN.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 22, 2015 3:22 PM  
**To:** Ziegler, Nathan; SOLIVEN, LEVY  
**Cc:** Brengelman, Lorie  
**Subject:** RE: SugarCreek Cambridge City WWTP Construction Permit Application (UPDATED Allocation Letter)

Nathan,

The Design Summary indicates an average flow of 167 gpm (240,480 gpd) to be discharged to Western Wayne RSD. The flow on this letter (200,000 gpd) will need to match the flow indicated on the Design Summary.

*Don Worley,*

**From:** Ziegler, Nathan <nziegler@sugar-creek.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 22, 2015 3:45 PM  
**To:** WORLEY, DON; SOLIVEN, LEVY  
**Cc:** Brengelman, Lorie  
**Subject:** RE: SugarCreek Cambridge City WWTP Construction Permit Application (UPDATED Allocation Letter)

Don

The average daily flow is based on 20 hours of operation/day. The remaining 4 hours is scheduled for daily sanitation requirements.

$200,000/20\text{hours}/60\text{minutes}= 166.67\text{gpm}$

Let me know if this will meet the requirement

Thanks

**Nate Ziegler**  
 Environmental Specialist  
 Work 513-551-5280 ext 5338  
 Mobile 513-266-9267

SugarCreek  
 12021 Sheraton Lane  
 Cincinnati, OH 45246  
[SugarCreek.com](http://SugarCreek.com)



- e. A follow up review and verification was also later made after Sugar Creek was issued its current IDEM IWP Permit No. INP000604 (11-1-16) (See Page 24):

### 2.3 Discharge Description

The permittee discharges wastewaters from the following sources to the POTW:

| <u>Source</u>   | <u>Flow (GPD)</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| Process Wastestream #1:   | 178,000 (1)       |
| Non-contact Cooling Towers:   | 15,000            |
| Boiler Blowdown:  | 1,000             |
| Sanitary:   | 6,000             |
| (1) Process Wastestream #1 is wastewater from the food production and sanitation processes. |                   |

- 2) Reviewed existing customer (other than Sugar Creek) flows to the Industrial Park Lift Station to ensure sufficient capacity.
- 3) Reviewed the design capacity of the Industrial Park Lift Station
  - a. 1999 Industrial Park Lift Station IDEM Permit
  - b. Existing Lift Station Fairbanks Pump Curves

**Request 1.3** Please provide a copy of the analysis requested in Request 1.2, as well as all documents which Waunalea Dungan considered or upon which she relied in signing the Capacity Certification/Allocation Letter.

**Response:** Respondent additionally objects to this Request to the extent it seeks analysis, calculation, compilation, or study which has not already been performed, memorialized in writing, to which Respondent objects to now having to perform. Without waiving any of the previously stated objections and in the spirit of cooperating in the discovery process, WWRSD provides the following response: See Response provided to Data Request #1.2, above; as well as attached exhibits provided on DVD files noted as:

- (1) WWRSD DR Response Exh 1.3(a);
- (2) WWRSD DR Response Exh 1.3(b); and
- (3) WWRSD DR Response Exh 1.3(c).

**Request 1.4** Do you agree that on or about January 17, 2017, WWRSD was unable to collect an average of 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek? If you agree,

- a. Please explain why you were unable to receive 200,000 gallons per day; and
- b. List the actions that were taken by WWRSD to correct the deficiency, including the dates of the various actions.

If you disagree, please provide all documents which relate to and our support your disagreement.

**Response:** Respondent respectfully objects to this Request as written as it is vague, ambiguous and unclear regarding what is meant by the phrase "...collect an average of 200,000 gallons per day..." Without waiving any of the previously stated objections and in the spirit of cooperating in the discovery process, WWRSD provides the following response:

Respondent agrees that there was an issue with the Industrial Park Lift Station that serves Sugar Creek at certain points of the day on January 17, 2017. The Lift Station was unable to keep pace with influent flows during certain periods. However, WWRSD cannot and does not agree that it was unable to accept 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek as we have no information verifying what the total flow (including Sugar Creek's Process Wastestream #1, cooling towers discharge, boiler blowdown discharge, and sanitary discharges – see below IDEM Permit guide), that was discharged by Sugar Creek into the system over each period of the entire 24-hours that make up this particular day. A root cause investigation has been initiated by Respondent and is not yet complete. WWRSD has sought assistance, cooperation and additional information from Sugar Creek as part of these efforts, but those efforts have been delayed, rebuffed, or refused. No final analysis or report has been completed as of this date.

### 2.3 Discharge Description

The permittee discharges wastewaters from the following sources to the POTW:

| <u>Source</u>               | <u>Flow (GPD)</u> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Process Wastestream #1:     | 178,000 (1)       |
| Non-contact Cooling Towers: | 15,000            |
| Boiler Blowdown:            | 1,000             |
| Sanitary:                   | 6,000             |

- (1) Process Wastestream #1 is wastewater from the food production and sanitation processes.

**Request 1.5:** Do you agree that on or about May 23, 2017, WWRSD was unable to collect an average of 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek? If you agree,

- a. Please explain why you were unable to receive 200,000 gallons per day;
- b. List the actions that were taken by WWRSD to correct the deficiency, including the dates of the various actions; and
- c. Has a root cause analysis been done of the events which caused the inability to receive the flow? If so, please produce a copy.

If you disagree, please provide all documents which relate to and our support your disagreement.

**Response:** Respondent respectfully objects to this Request as written as it is vague, ambiguous and unclear regarding what is meant by the phrase "...collect an average of 200,000 gallons per day..." Without waiving any of the previously stated objections and in the spirit of cooperating in the discovery process, WWRSD provides the following response:

- a. Respondent agrees that there was an issue with the Industrial Park Lift Station that serves Sugar Creek at certain points of the day on May 23, 2017. The Lift Station was unable to keep pace with influent flows during certain periods. However, WWRSD cannot and does not agree that it was unable to accept 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek as we have no information verifying what the total flow (including Sugar Creek's Process Wastestream #1, cooling towers discharge, boiler blowdown discharge, and sanitary discharges – see below IDEM Permit guide), that was discharged by Sugar Creek into the system over each period of the entire 24 hours that make up this particular day.
- b. As Sugar Creek knows, new, higher capacity pumps were installed by WWRSD in February 2017 at the Industrial Park Lift Station. The new pumps suffered an unexpected malfunction due to what was suspected to be extremely high flows into the Lift Station. Those pump malfunctions were promptly corrected by WWRSD and the new pump vendor/installer within 24 hours. Review efforts of the new pump malfunction and lift station flows are ongoing. In addition, WWRSD has put into place additional measures to ensure no further issues. Such preventive measures include the rental and recent installation of two (2) 385 gpm, diesel backup pumps, one at the Industrial Park Lift Station and the second at the CH Lift Station. The diesel backup pump installations were completed on June 15, 2017.
- c. A root cause investigation has been initiated by Respondent and is not yet complete. WWRSD has sought assistance, cooperation and additional information

from Sugar Creek as part of these efforts, but those efforts have been delayed, rebuffed, or refused. No final analysis or report has been completed as of this date.



**Request 1.6** What assurance can WSRSD provide Sugar Creek that there will be no future interruptions in its ability to collect on average 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek?

**Response:** Respondent respectfully objects to this Request as written because it incorrectly and improperly makes the assertion that WWRSD has not been able to collect on average 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek. There has been no evidence or showing that WWRSD has not and cannot receive and process an average of 200,000 gallons per day from Sugar Creek. Without waiving any objections and in the spirit of cooperating in the discovery process, Respondent states that, through its current lift station root cause investigation, it is in the process of gathering relevant data and information related to any service issues and hopes that Sugar Creek will cooperate and assist in such efforts. In the interim, Respondent notes that it has promptly pursued (and refers Sugar Creek to the): interim efforts summarized in Response to DR #1.59b) above; as well as the continuing overall plant upgrade evaluations and proposals which are currently being considered and reviewed by the WWRSD Board. The WWRSD through its Board Members and able staff and consultants, diligently provide high quality service and timely attention to all service issues for each and every one of our valued customers, including Sugar Creek. Respondent has capably provided safe, reliable, and reasonably priced sewage collection and treatment services to our customers and fully intends to continue doing so for the foreseeable future, consistent with our corporate formation directives and duties and our enabling statutes and ordinances.

**Request 1.7** Produce all documents (including notes, memoranda, and correspondence) that discuss and/or relate to:

- a. The Capacity Certification attached hereto;
- b. WWRSD's ability or inability to accept all flow from Sugar Creek on either January 17, 2017 or May 23, 2017;
- c. Actions taken by WWRSD to address the inability to receive all flow from Sugar Creek on either January 17, 2017 or May 23, 2017; and
- d. Service to Sugar Creek.

**Response:** In addition to the general applicable objections provided above, Respondent respectfully objects to this Request as written as it: is so overly broad and expansive that it is unduly burdensome; seeks information already in Sugar Creek's possession; seeks information which is duplicative, or more easily obtainable through other less burdensome, public information sources; and seeks information that is subject to the attorney/client, work product, settlement negotiation, or other applicable privileges. Without waiving any of the previously stated objections and in the spirit of cooperating in the discovery process, WWRSD provides the following response:

- a. See responses to Data Requests #1.2 and #1.3, above, as well as Data Response attachment Exhibits provided on the enclosed DVD.
- b. See responses to Data Requests #1.4, #1.5, and #1.6, above.
- c. See all above objections and responses.

ATTACHMENT RH-4  
FILED SEPARATELY

| Date       | SOFTENER<br>REGEN<br>(estimates<br>based on % of<br>water softned) | CONDENSER<br>COOLING<br>TOWER<br>DRAIN | BOILER<br>BLOW<br>DOWN<br>COOLING<br>WATER | SANITARY | WW<br>TREATMENT<br>PLANT<br>EFFLUENT | CALCULATED<br>TOTAL WATER TO<br>WWRSD<br>(B+C+D+E+F) | FRAC TANKS   |
|------------|--|--|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| 2017-01-02 | 37,184   | 7,000                                  | 1,310                                      | 1,500    | 135,274                              | 182,268  |              |
| 2017-01-03 | 53,360   | 7,000                                  | 1,320                                      | 1,500    | 178,397                              | 241,577  |              |
| 2017-01-04 | 45,952   | 7,000                                  | 1,290                                      | 1,500    | 200,483                              | 256,225  |              |
| 2017-01-05 | 42,704   | 7,000                                  | 1,320                                      | 1,500    | 223,922                              | 276,446  |              |
| 2017-01-06 | 42,912   | 7,000                                  | 1,450                                      | 1,500    | 239,647                              | 292,509  |              |
| 2017-01-07 | 24,336   | 7,000                                  | 1,560                                      | 1,500    | 134,561                              | 168,957  |              |
| 2017-01-08 | 9,680  | 7,000                                  | 1,590                                      | 1,500    | 42,555                               | 62,325   |              |
| 2017-01-09 | 32,480   | 7,000                                  | 1,580                                      | 1,500    | 111,158                              | 153,718  |              |
| 2017-01-10 | 49,440   | 7,000                                  | 1,550                                      | 1,500    | 194,597                              | 254,087  |              |
| 2017-01-11 | 51,056   | 7,000                                  | 1,530                                      | 1,500    | 217,606                              | 278,692  |              |
| 2017-01-12 | 48,048   | 7,000                                  | 1,500                                      | 1,500    | 190,365                              | 248,413  |              |
| 2017-01-13 | 48,576   | 7,000                                  | 1,540                                      | 1,500    | 172,334                              | 230,950  |              |
| 2017-01-14 | 25,056   | 7,000                                  | 1,560                                      | 1,500    | 187,682                              | 222,798  |              |
| 2017-01-15 | 14,480   | 7,000                                  | 1,320                                      | 1,500    | 128,299                              | 152,599  |              |
| 2017-01-16 | 43,136   | 7,000                                  | 1,550                                      | 1,500    | 142,052                              | 195,238  |              |
| 2017-01-17 | 47,312   | 7,000                                  | 1,380                                      | 1,500    | 140,766                              | 197,958  |              |
| 2017-01-18 | 48,432   | 7,000                                  | 1,480                                      | 1,500    | 102,162                              | 160,574  |              |
| 2017-01-19 | 11,056   | 7,000                                  | 1,240                                      | 1,500    | 130,625                              | 151,421  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-20 | 44,672   | 7,000                                  | 1,480                                      | 1,500    | 195,227                              | 249,879  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-21 | 50,336   | 7,000                                  | 2,590                                      | 1,500    | 203,219                              | 264,645  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-22 | 29,792   | 7,000                                  | 4,430                                      | 1,500    | 152,752                              | 195,474  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-23 | 37,264   | 7,000                                  | 5,010                                      | 1,500    | 138,366                              | 189,140  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-24 | 46,528   | 7,000                                  | 4,360                                      | 1,500    | 204,896                              | 264,284  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-25 | 50,896   | 7,000                                  | 3,640                                      | 1,500    | 179,377                              | 242,413  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-26 | 50,752   | 7,000                                  | 3,040                                      | 1,500    | 214,388                              | 276,680  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-27 | 14,832   | 7,000                                  | 2,520                                      | 1,500    | 198,503                              | 224,355  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-28 | 44,000   | 7,000                                  | 5,760                                      | 1,500    | 157,416                              | 215,676  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-29 | 25,760   | 7,000                                  | 2,920                                      | 1,500    | 145,841                              | 183,021  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-30 | 30,384   | 7,000                                  | 4,260                                      | 1,500    | 79,364                               | 122,508  | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-01-31 | 46,848   | 7,000                                  | 4,270                                      | 1,500    | 179,218                              | 238,836  | 8 frac tanks |

| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>38,242</b> | <b>7,000</b> | <b>2,345</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>164,035</b> | <b>213,122</b> |              |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
| 2017-02-01     | 49,136        | 7,000        | 4,260        | 1,500        | 211,977        | 273,873        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-02     | 45,344        | 7,000        | 4,260        | 1,500        | 190,374        | 248,478        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-03     | 45,680        | 7,000        | 3,750        | 1,500        | 175,784        | 233,714        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-04     | 45,504        | 7,000        | 3,560        | 1,500        | 174,004        | 231,568        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-05     | 20,160        | 7,000        | 3,690        | 1,500        | 109,574        | 141,924        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-06     | 32,384        | 7,000        | 3,700        | 1,500        | 103,711        | 148,295        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-07     | 51,392        | 7,000        | 3,700        | 1,500        | 207,761        | 271,353        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-08     | 45,488        | 7,000        | 3,700        | 1,500        | 193,929        | 251,617        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-09     | 48,144        | 7,000        | 3,710        | 1,500        | 206,770        | 267,124        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-10     | 45,536        | 7,000        | 3,720        | 1,500        | 146,430        | 204,186        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-11     | 32,672        | 7,000        | 3,710        | 1,500        | 164,214        | 209,096        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-12     | 20,352        | 7,000        | 3,690        | 1,500        | 98,466         | 131,008        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-13     | 37,872        | 7,000        | 3,720        | 1,500        | 136,485        | 186,577        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-14     | 47,856        | 7,000        | 3,730        | 1,500        | 184,136        | 244,222        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-15     | 44,528        | 7,000        | 3,730        | 1,500        | 171,914        | 228,672        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-16     | 46,032        | 7,000        | 3,930        | 1,500        | 183,660        | 242,122        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-17     | 43,584        | 7,000        | 5,800        | 1,500        | 175,584        | 233,468        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-18     | 29,920        | 7,000        | 5,820        | 1,500        | 133,918        | 178,158        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-19     | 17,360        | 7,000        | 5,830        | 1,500        | 76,985         | 108,675        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-20     | 34,544        | 7,000        | 5,830        | 1,500        | 102,405        | 151,279        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-21     | 44,096        | 7,000        | 5,820        | 1,500        | 171,738        | 230,154        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-22     | 43,600        | 7,000        | 5,810        | 1,500        | 146,725        | 204,635        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-23     | 43,856        | 7,000        | 5,800        | 1,500        | 176,608        | 234,764        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-24     | 43,360        | 7,000        | 5,790        | 1,500        | 162,499        | 220,149        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-25     | 25,440        | 7,000        | 4,360        | 1,500        | 129,754        | 168,054        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-26     | 12,032        | 7,000        | 3,070        | 1,500        | 55,463         | 79,065         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-27     | 34,448        | 7,000        | 2,820        | 1,500        | 121,102        | 166,870        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-02-28     | 45,088        | 7,000        | 3,050        | 1,500        | 143,554        | 200,192        | 8 frac tanks |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>38,407</b> | <b>7,000</b> | <b>4,299</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>151,983</b> | <b>203,189</b> |              |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
| 2017-03-01     | 46,512        | 7,000        | 3,130        | 1,500        | 182,436        | 240,578        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-02     | 39,008        | 7,000        | 970          | 1,500        | 175,242        | 223,720        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-03     | 45,280        | 7,000        | 960          | 1,500        | 168,151        | 222,891        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-04     | 31,376        | 7,000        | 1,270        | 1,500        | 125,586        | 166,732        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-05     | 17,760        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 97,017         | 124,567        | 8 frac tanks |

|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 2017-03-06     | 32,480        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 101,656        | 143,946        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-07     | 39,936        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 160,112        | 209,848        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-08     | 43,760        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 166,759        | 220,309        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-09     | 41,360        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 154,332        | 205,482        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-10     | 25,536        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 146,557        | 181,883        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-11     | 16,528        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 37,166         | 63,494         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-12     | 10,176        | 7,000        | 1,240        | 1,500        | 94,274         | 114,190        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-13     | 35,232        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 93,262         | 138,294        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-14     | 41,008        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 160,714        | 211,522        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-15     | 41,312        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 155,285        | 206,407        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-16     | 42,640        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 152,216        | 204,666        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-17     | 30,032        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 163,799        | 203,631        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-18     | 24,944        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 89,701         | 124,435        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-19     | 15,424        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 84,810         | 110,024        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-20     | 30,992        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 49,574         | 90,366         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-21     | 38,128        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 139,101        | 187,029        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-22     | 44,528        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 178,180        | 232,508        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-23     | 48,288        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 232,175        | 290,263        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-24     | 39,776        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 234,108        | 283,684        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-25     | 27,184        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 107,772        | 144,756        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-26     | 12,224        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 58,479         | 80,513         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-27     | 34,464        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 150,068        | 194,332        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-28     | 42,640        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 49,003         | 101,443        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-29     | 41,696        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 198,570        | 250,076        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-30     | 47,296        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 198,400        | 255,496        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-03-31     | 41,136        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 173,732        | 224,668        | 8 frac tanks |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>34,473</b> | <b>7,000</b> | <b>1,334</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>138,008</b> | <b>182,315</b> |              |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
| 2017-04-01     | 21,440        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 110,236        | 141,476        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-02     | 13,152        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 51,657         | 74,609         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-03     | 37,440        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 135,991        | 183,231        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-04     | 40,272        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 153,390        | 203,452        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-05     | 35,040        | 7,000        | 1,180        | 1,500        | 180,236        | 224,956        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-06     | 43,376        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 172,511        | 225,697        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-07     | 44,752        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 180,048        | 234,610        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-08     | 28,464        | 7,000        | 1,290        | 1,500        | 122,006        | 160,260        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-09     | 9,008         | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 35,178         | 53,986         | 8 frac tanks |

|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 2017-04-10     | 34,000        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 107,558        | 151,368        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-11     | 45,504        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 176,635        | 231,949        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-12     | 47,072        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 185,034        | 241,906        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-13     | 50,096        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 191,699        | 251,605        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-14     | 47,968        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 209,935        | 267,713        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-15     | 29,760        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 122,972        | 162,542        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-16     | 10,672        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 46,185         | 66,657         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-17     | 33,200        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 126,930        | 169,940        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-18     | 47,120        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 193,647        | 250,577        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-19     | 47,120        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 187,483        | 244,413        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-20     | 45,664        | 7,000        | 1,260        | 1,500        | 205,820        | 261,244        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-21     | 40,464        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 184,102        | 234,366        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-22     | 20,880        | 7,000        | 1,300        | 1,500        | 98,379         | 129,059        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-23     | 10,672        | 7,000        | 1,280        | 1,500        | 45,355         | 65,807         | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-24     | 38,704        | 7,000        | 1,310        | 1,500        | 103,967        | 152,481        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-25     | 50,672        | 7,000        | 1,100        | 1,500        | 185,922        | 246,194        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-26     | 48,368        | 7,000        | 720          | 1,500        | 190,980        | 248,568        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-27     | 45,696        | 7,000        | 730          | 1,500        | 229,229        | 284,155        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-28     | 39,664        | 7,000        | 720          | 1,500        | 190,592        | 239,476        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-29     | 22,112        | 7,000        | 730          | 1,500        | 167,719        | 199,061        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-04-30     | 12,848        | 7,000        | 740          | 1,500        | 42,896         | 64,984         | 8 frac tanks |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>34,707</b> | <b>7,000</b> | <b>1,195</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>144,476</b> | <b>188,878</b> |              |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
| 2017-05-01     | 34,656        | 7,000        | 740          | 1,500        | 143,812        | 187,708        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-02     | 42,688        | 7,000        | 740          | 1,500        | 182,878        | 234,806        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-03     | 45,328        | 7,000        | 740          | 1,500        | 179,508        | 234,076        | 8 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-04     | 39,936        | 7,000        | 740          | 1,500        | 124,357        | 173,533        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-05     | 36,512        | 7,000        | 750          | 1,500        | 124,034        | 169,796        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-06     | 32,784        | 7,000        | 740          | 1,500        | 186,499        | 228,523        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-07     | 13,312        | 7,000        | 750          | 1,500        | 56,905         | 79,467         | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-08     | 33,568        | 7,000        | 750          | 1,500        | 110,115        | 152,933        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-09     | 41,200        | 7,000        | 750          | 1,500        | 230,647        | 281,097        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-10     | 48,080        | 7,000        | 640          | 1,500        | 230,648        | 287,868        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-11     | 48,848        | 7,000        | 680          | 1,500        | 207,613        | 265,641        | 2 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-12     | 31,728        | 7,000        | 730          | 1,500        | 151,114        | 192,072        | 0 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-13     | 21,232        | 7,000        | 1,680        | 1,500        | 108,662        | 140,074        | 0 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-14     | 7,392         | 7,000        | 1,970        | 1,500        | 7,219          | 25,081         | 0 frac tanks |

|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |               |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| 2017-05-15     | 33,328        | 7,000        | 1,470        | 1,500        | 177,772        | 221,070        | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-16     | 47,744        | 7,000        | 870          | 1,500        | 208,179        | 265,293        | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-17     | 46,240        | 7,000        | 880          | 1,500        | 245,856        | 301,476        | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-18     | 45,744        | 7,000        | 890          | 1,500        | 23,060         | 78,194         | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-19     | 47,824        | 7,000        | 900          | 1,500        | 248,486        | 305,710        | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-20     | 25,920        | 7,000        | 600          | 1,500        | 130,168        | 165,188        | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-21     | 10,480        | 7,000        | 3,460        | 1,500        | 50,881         | 73,321         | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-22     | 34,912        | 7,000        | 5,650        | 1,500        | 151,341        | 200,403        | 0 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-23     | 49,456        | 7,000        | 6,990        | 1,500        | 79,516         | 144,462        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-05-24     | 43,808        | 7,000        | 3,640        | 1,500        | 164,000        | 219,948        | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-25     | 42,144        | 7,000        | 3,690        | 1,500        | 212,827        | 267,161        | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-26     | 42,640        | 7,000        | 3,950        | 1,500        | 213,957        | 269,047        | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-27     | 25,952        | 7,000        | 3,000        | 1,500        | 268,165        | 305,617        | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-28     | 11,808        | 7,000        | 1,030        | 1,500        | 111,664        | 133,002        | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-29     | 8,912         | 7,000        | 1,030        | 1,500        | 30,897         | 49,339         | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-30     | 35,424        | 7,000        | 1,560        | 1,500        | 183,152        | 228,636        | 10 frac tanks |
| 2017-05-31     | 46,288        | 7,000        | 2,640        | 1,500        | 218,242        | 275,670        | 8 frac tanks  |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>34,706</b> | <b>7,000</b> | <b>1,763</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>153,619</b> | <b>198,587</b> |               |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |               |
| 2017-06-01     | 46,832        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 217,703        | 275,715        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-02     | 45,312        | 7,000        | 2,670        | 1,500        | 213,879        | 270,361        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-03     | 49,184        | 7,000        | 2,670        | 1,500        | 229,195        | 289,549        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-04     | 24,192        | 7,000        | 2,670        | 1,500        | 127,328        | 162,690        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-05     | 35,520        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 118,869        | 165,569        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-06     | 47,488        | 7,000        | 2,670        | 1,500        | 196,357        | 255,015        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-07     | 45,088        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 214,342        | 270,610        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-08     | 44,720        | 7,000        | 2,670        | 1,500        | 206,155        | 262,045        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-09     | 42,560        | 7,000        | 2,490        | 1,500        | 205,732        | 259,282        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-10     | 26,064        | 7,000        | 2,670        | 1,500        | 118,454        | 155,688        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-11     | 13,440        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 38,088         | 62,708         | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-12     | 28,128        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 175,806        | 215,114        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-13     | 41,408        | 7,000        | 2,510        | 1,500        | 187,033        | 239,451        | 8 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-14     | 43,296        | 7,000        | 2,570        | 1,500        | 212,645        | 267,011        | 6 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-15     | 46,096        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 226,000        | 283,276        | 6 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-16     | 48,320        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 205,468        | 264,968        | 6 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-17     | 27,344        | 7,000        | 2,680        | 1,500        | 36,536         | 75,060         | 6 frac tanks  |
| 2017-06-18     | 7,552         | 7,000        | 4,630        | 1,500        | 74,449         | 95,131         | 6 frac tanks  |



|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 2017-06-19     | 30,960        | 7,000        | 6,580        | 1,500        | 203,787        | 249,827        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-20     | 42,592        | 7,000        | 4,370        | 1,500        | 162,185        | 217,647        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-21     | 45,616        | 7,000        | 3,960        | 1,500        | 187,641        | 245,717        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-22     | 49,040        | 7,000        | 4,070        | 1,500        | 261,077        | 322,687        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-23     | 47,776        | 7,000        | 4,000        | 1,500        | 230,179        | 290,455        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-24     | 27,184        | 7,000        | 4,090        | 1,500        | 75,301         | 115,075        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-25     | 20,752        | 7,000        | 4,080        | 1,500        | 136,341        | 169,673        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-26     | 36,352        | 7,000        | 4,080        | 1,500        | 174,683        | 223,615        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-27     | 40,208        | 7,000        | 4,080        | 1,500        | 196,612        | 249,400        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-28     | 43,520        | 7,000        | 4,070        | 1,500        | 220,860        | 276,950        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-29     | 44,448        | 7,000        | 3,950        | 1,500        | 199,945        | 256,843        | 6 frac tanks |
| 2017-06-30     | 52,560        | 7,000        | 4,080        | 1,500        | 133,401        | 198,541        | 6 frac tanks |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>38,118</b> | <b>7,000</b> | <b>3,369</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>172,868</b> | <b>222,856</b> |              |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
| 2017-07-01     | 30,256        | 7,000        | 4,090        | 1,500        | 206,268        | 249,114        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-02     | 15,664        | 7,000        | 4,090        | 1,500        | 48,251         | 76,505         | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-03     | 33,376        | 7,000        | 4,070        | 1,500        | 156,383        | 202,329        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-04     | 26,384        | 7,000        | 3,930        | 1,500        | 129,464        | 168,278        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-05     | 39,392        | 7,000        | 4,270        | 1,500        | 176,268        | 228,430        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-06     | 48,112        | 7,000        | 4,280        | 1,500        | 260,421        | 321,313        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-07     | 56,000        | 5,307        | 4,280        | 1,500        | 236,613        | 303,700        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-08     | 46,638        | 14,830       | 4,190        | 1,500        | 264,087        | 331,245        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-09     | 34,700        | 5,876        | 4,280        | 1,500        | 153,213        | 199,569        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-10     | 45,700        | 7,757        | 4,280        | 1,500        | 230,203        | 289,440        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-11     | 47,000        | 8,162        | 4,290        | 1,500        | 223,483        | 284,435        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-12     | 42,400        | 7,333        | 4,280        | 1,500        | 220,763        | 276,276        | 4 frac tanks |
| 2017-07-13     | 20,300        | 3,703        | 2,040        | 1,500        | 224,602        | 252,145        | 4 frac tanks |
| <b>AVERAGE</b> | <b>37,379</b> | <b>7,305</b> | <b>4,028</b> | <b>1,500</b> | <b>194,617</b> | <b>244,829</b> |              |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |
|                |               |              |              |              |                |                |              |

= estimated

**Kile, Nicholas**

---

**From:** Rodden, Edward <ERodden@sugar-creek.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 23, 2017 6:15 PM  
**To:** 'dunganplumbing@frontier.com'  
**Cc:** 'apoin Dexter@apwlawyer.com'; Tamborski, Peter; Brengelman, Lorie; Holbrook, Ronald; Dearman, Victor; 'Bob Bever'  
**Subject:** Re: Status of Lift Station

I was at the plant today, stopped to see Darlene who wasn't there as I found out.

I did see the gate valve used to control the influent flow, and it appeared to be closed to a great degree and restricting flow.

I don't understand. We were always told there was no way to restrict flow, and when we are having problems at the lift station that indicate back pressure down the line, I was surprised to see the flow restricted.

What is up with this?

Ed Rodden  
Sugar Creek Packing  
[erodden@sugarcreek.com](mailto:erodden@sugarcreek.com)

---

**From:** Rodden, Edward  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 23, 2017 11:17 AM  
**To:** 'dunganplumbing@frontier.com'  
**Cc:** 'apoin Dexter@apwlawyer.com'; Tamborski, Peter; Brengelman, Lorie; Holbrook, Ronald; Dearman, Victor; 'Bob Bever'  
**Subject:** Status of Lift Station

We continue to have problems, shut down at the lift station this morning.

Turpin is trying to drain down to be able to access the pumps but that seems to be going unnaturally slow.

At this point we will have to shut down production later on today if we don't get running.

ATTACHMENT RH-7  
FILED SEPARATELY