

VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM

FOUNDED 1853



Wastewater Committee Agenda
Monday, June 1st 2026, 9:00 AM
Village Hall 9996 Water Street

NOTE: This Meeting of the Village Wastewater Committee will also be held via teleconferencing. It will be available to the public to attend in person or by computer, phone, tablet, or dial-in. Connection information is included below in this notice.

1. Call to order
2. Changes in Agenda
3. Previous minutes May 11th, 2026
4. Visitors' comments
5. Ephraim Wastewater Operator in Charge Report.
6. Discussion and consideration of the 2025 WI DNR eCMAR report.
7. Discussion and consideration of resolution 02-2026 - Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Wisc. Admin. Code NR 208 – Compliance Maintenance Resolution.
8. Visitors' comments
9. New business for next meeting
10. Adjournment

WW Meeting

Jun 1, 2026, 9:00 – 11:00 AM (America/Chicago)

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://meet.goto.com/701935477>

You can also dial in using your phone.

Access Code: 701-935-477

United States: [+1 \(571\) 317-3122](tel:+15713173122)

**It is possible that a quorum of the Village Board or other Village Committees may be present at the meeting. However, no action will be taken by any other Board or Committee unless specifically noticed.*

Date <u>5/29/2026</u>	
Andrea Collak, Clerk	<u>X</u> Village Administrative Office
	<u>X</u> Visitors' Center
Kim Roberts, Deputy Clerk	<u>X</u> Post Office
	<u>X</u> Website www.ephraim-wisconsin.com
	<u>X</u> Emailed to WDOR/Peninsula Pulse

VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM

FOUNDED 1853



Wastewater Committee Minutes Monday, May 11, 2026, 9:00 AM

Present: Karen McMurtry- Chair, Rick Hoyerman, Bruce Nelson, Jim Peterman

Absent: Dennis Jewell

Staff: Brad Rasmusson – Wastewater Manager/Operator in Charge, Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk/Utility Clerk, Brent Bristol-Administrator

Online: Andrea Collak – Clerk/Treasurer, Daniel Oakley – Wastewater Operator

1. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order by Chair - McMurtry and a quorum was present for this meeting.
2. **Changes in Agenda:** None
3. **Previous minutes – Minutes from April 6, 2026**

Peterman moved, McMurtry seconded to approve April 6, 2026, meeting minutes as presented, all ayes, and the motion carried.

4. **Visitors' comments:** None

5. **Ephraim Plant Manager Report:**

Rasmusson reviewed the WW, WWT, and SS OIC reports as included in the agenda packet. Wastewater duties were completed according to schedule.

Rasmusson noted that the Wastewater Department installed UV system and started up without any issues.

They set up trash pump at lift 1 in preparation for possible backups due to high flows during rain and snow melting. Fortunately, they never used it. We did have 345,000 gallons flow through the plant within a 24-hour period.

They spent several days looking for sources of infiltration. Great Lakes TV & Seal came on-site for two days with their camera truck. 5 leaking manholes were found, 4 have been repaired already, 1 sump pump connected to the sewer which has been shut off, and about 6 cracked or broken laterals. Rasmusson has been in contact with most of them and repairs are in the process.

The sewer flushing was completed. They will be scheduling the lift stations cleaning.

They sent out all the required effluent samples for our discharge permit renewal and will hopefully finish the renewal process soon.

Also, annual sludge characteristics test along with PFAS test required by Sturgeon Bay for their permit renewal.

Ephraim Well Water Testing: Year to Date

Number of Water Tests: 147	304
In-House Bacteria: 107	262
Clean Water Testing: 40	42

Ephraim Septage Service: Year to Date

Holding Tank Pump Outs: 4	9
Septic Pump Outs/Inspections:	
Emergency Call Ins:	

6. Discussion regarding residential REU rate structure

McMurtry introduced this agenda item by acknowledging the extensive work that had been put into the analysis and invited Deputy Clerk Kim Roberts to present the proposed residential REU rate structure framework to the committee.

Deputy Clerk Roberts opened by framing the discussion as a starting point for conversation, emphasizing that the committee was not yet talking about rates — only about the methodology for assigning Residential Equivalency Units (REUs). She explained that the current system assigns flat 1 REU to all residential properties in the Village, based on an assumed 300 gallons per day, regardless of home size. After months of research and analysis, she concluded that this approach no longer reflects equitable service access across the Village's varying residential properties.

Roberts presented the proposed methodology, which is grounded in Wisconsin Standardized Plumbing Code SPS 383 — the same code used to design on-site wastewater systems. Under this standard, flow is calculated at 150 gallons per day per bedroom, based on the assumption of two occupants per bedroom, each averaging 50 gallons per day, with a 1.5 safety factor applied. Using this methodology, the existing 300 gallons per day baseline was determined to be appropriate only for 1- to 2-bedroom homes — meaning the current flat-rate assignment has likely been under-assigning REUs for larger properties for years.

Roberts described the extensive database that had been constructed to support this work, drawing on the municipal assessor's records, property files, real estate listings, short-term rental license applications, and plan committee records — including, in some cases, building plans reviewed to confirm bedroom counts. She noted with some humor that the resulting binder was "too heavy" to bring to the meeting.

Proposed Rate Structure

The proposed framework assigns REUs on a sliding scale, increasing by one-half REU with each additional bedroom beyond the first two:

- 1–2 bedrooms (or studio): 1.0 REU / 300 gallons per day
- 3 bedrooms: 1.5 REUs / 450 gallons per day
- 4 bedrooms: 2.0 REUs / 600 gallons per day
- And so on, with each additional bedroom adding 0.5 REU

Roberts presented sample comparisons using Water Street properties, illustrating current versus proposed REU assignments alongside current and projected quarterly and annual billing at the existing rate of \$150 per REU, along with the resulting percentage change.

Multiple Structures and Condo Associations

Roberts addressed how properties with multiple structures would be handled: each structure on a parcel would receive its own REU assignment based on its bedroom count, and those would be totaled for the parcel. She illustrated an example where one structure had three bedrooms (1.5

REUs) and a second had two bedrooms (1.0 REU), yielding a combined parcel assignment of 2.5 REUs.

She also presented an example of a condominium association that had historically been assigned a blended REU figure of 6.46 REUs, whereas under the proposed framework, each individual unit within the association would be assigned its own REU based on bedroom count. Roberts noted that in the past, similar properties had been handled inconsistently, and the new framework would create uniformity across the board.

The discussion that followed was substantive and largely supportive of the proposed approach.

Peterman expressed strong enthusiasm, noting that a well-classified, data-driven system eliminates the need for subjective annual catch-up and ensures that every property owner pays a fair share. He acknowledged the real-world complexity of the issue, sharing that he had even fielded inquiries from property owners wishing to run sewer lines to garages with upstairs bedrooms — a scenario that carries significant compliance implications. He stressed that with a defensible, standardized system in place, the committee need not apologize for rate changes: "If we're behind on our schedule, then this is what you have to pay."

Hoyerman thanked Roberts for the work, characterizing it as "way above and beyond," and then raised a series of clarifying questions. Hoyerman asked how zero-bedroom structures (e.g., sheds or garages connected to sewer) would be handled; Roberts confirmed that the defining factor is whether the structure is connected to the sewer system — if connected, it receives at minimum a 1 REU assignment. Hoyerman then asked how bedroom counts would be determined and verified. Roberts explained that the assessor assigns bedroom counts during property valuation, often estimating from exterior square footage, but that her research process had involved a back-and-forth exchange with the assessor, in many cases updating his records based on STR license applications, personal property files, and real estate listings. Hoyerman acknowledged that disputes from homeowners who disagree with their bedroom count would ultimately be a matter for the homeowner to resolve with the assessor. He concluded by asking whether Roberts had encountered any rate structures in her research that used a declining marginal increment — where, for example, the value assigned per additional bedroom decreases at higher counts. Roberts indicated she had not seen any such models; she emphasized that the goal is to ensure sufficient revenue to meet the financial demands of the treatment facility, and that flat incremental increases are the prevailing approach.

Nelson raised the question of seasonality, noting that many homes in Ephraim are seasonal-use properties. McMurtry confirmed that the village's ordinance already addresses this and that seasonal-use objections had previously been raised and addressed — the connection to the system is the determining factor, not frequency of use. Nelson also asked where the 150 gallons per day per bedroom figure originated. Roberts confirmed it derives from Wisconsin Standardized Plumbing Code SPS 383, describing it as a "very good methodology" because it is the same standard used for designing the systems that generate the discharge. Nelson confirmed that this made the standard "defendable."

Rasmusson confirmed that he had been using Roberts' research to investigate specific properties — she had provided him with a list of structures that might be connected but were not currently on the billing rolls. He noted that two such properties had already been identified. Roberts acknowledged there remain additional properties where it is still unclear whether secondary

structures are actively connected to the sewer, and that this would need to be resolved before finalizing assignments.

Peterman raised a philosophical question about whether the proposed assignment accurately captures actual usage — noting, for example, that an older couple in a 4-bedroom home is likely to discharge far less than a full occupancy. Roberts addressed this directly and without hesitation: the property could be sold, and the new owners might use it as a rental or bed-and-breakfast. The REU assignment follows the property, not the occupants. Roberts summarized: "It's factual. How many bedrooms do you have? How many connections do you have? And it doesn't change how you're using the properties." This approach was well received by the committee members as being both transparent and easy for residents to understand.

Nelson observed that under this framework, the number of addresses or structures on a parcel becomes irrelevant — only the total bedroom count across all connected structures matters. Roberts confirmed this, noting that it significantly simplifies administration.

McMurtry asked what the committee needed to formally do at this meeting. Roberts indicated that a formal motion was not necessary — a consensus to continue down this path would be sufficient. Once the full residential analysis is complete and commercial REU assignments are developed, the full package will be returned to the committee, at which point rates could be evaluated with the auditor.

Roberts indicated she was approximately 65–70% complete with the commercial REU analysis. McMurtry explained that she had intentionally withheld asking Roberts to invest further time in commercial analysis until the committee had reviewed and accepted the residential framework — to avoid compounding her effort if the approach were to be rejected.

Hoyerman suggested that when the matter eventually comes forward for formal action, the committee should present residential and commercial together as a single recommendation to the Village Board, rather than in pieces. He acknowledged his preference was partly practical — as a Board member, he would rather receive it all at once.

Regarding the commercial methodology, Bristol noted that the bedroom-based methodology would naturally carry over to lodging-type commercial properties such as hotels and motels, but that restaurants, retail, and other uses would require a different approach. The use of established metrics — rather than village-created formulas — was highlighted as a strength. The comment was made that while a metric can be challenged, using a code-based standard is "totally defensible." The committee consensus was to continue developing the commercial analysis.

The Chair, McMurtry and committee members thanked Roberts warmly for her work, with one member describing the effort as "a project" requiring "a lot of time."

7. Visitors' comments: None

8. New business for the next meeting:

McMurtry raised the pending engineering questions submitted to McMahon Engineering. Rasmusson noted he had not yet received responses

Bristol added that the inquiry he sent to McMahon centered on clarifying the current state of the wastewater improvement project phasing, specifically with respect to the solar component: what work had already been paid for, what remains, and whether solar could move forward as a

standalone submission for Clean Water Fund financing independent of any larger project bundle. Bristol noted that as of the meeting, no final decision had been made on whether to bundle all improvements for a 2027 application or to resubmit the solar component as a standalone Phase 1 for 2027. He expressed some frustration that clarity had been elusive, noting there had previously been "some confusion with dates" related to the solar timeline.

Key open questions communicated to the engineer included: whether solar engineering was sufficiently complete to go to bid; what costs remain; what the lead times are for various components; and what specific work had already been paid for versus what would need additional expenditure. Bristol noted that the 2027 Clean Water Fund application deadline falls in September, making timelines important to nail down. He acknowledged that the engineer had not yet responded but had apparently been asked "some decent questions."

Rasmusson indicated he would also follow up on permit applications concurrently.

The next meeting was set for **June 1, 2026**.

9. Adjournment

McMurtry moved, Hoyerman seconded to adjourn the meeting, all ayes, and the motion carried.
--

Recorded by Andrea Collak - Clerk/Treasurer

May 2026
Ephraim WW, WWT, SS
Manager OIC Report



EFF samples sent to Northern Lake Services for ammonia testing:

Ph testing: Five times per week as required.

TSS, BOD, Po4, labs with lab cleanup: Twice per week as required.

Eff E-coli test, this must be done May-October once per week while running disinfection.

- Sent out, completed, and submitted 2026 sludge characteristics test.
- Great Lakes TV & Seal cleaned the lift stations. We again used a dewatering bag to dump the waste into then hauled and dumped at GFL.
- Sent out more effluent samples for permit renewal testing. Almost done, we will submit once testing is completed.
- We conducted interviews and hired Nathan Merkle for the summer season, welcome aboard.
- Gathered and entered data for ECMAR.
- Removed North Shore Rd. winter SOP equipment.
- Assisted the maintenance department with assembling and installing flags for streetlights.

Ephraim Well Water Testing		Year to Date
Number of Water Tests:	172	476
In-House Bacteria:	159	421
Clean Water Testing:	13	55
Ephraim Septage Service:		
Holding Tank Pump Outs:	7	16
Septic Pump Outs / Inspections:		
Emergency Call Ins:		
Weather:		
Precip:	2.45	16.26
Max Temp:	84	84
Min Temp:	31	-17

Respectfully submitted,
Brad Rasmusson

Village of Ephraim
Wastewater Manager

Updates for June meeting

Sludge

2026 Sludge characteristics have been completed along with PFOS testing required by Sturgeon Bay.

Permit

We are continuing to work on our permit renewal process; we have one more effluent sample to take which we will take on Monday. Once we receive the results I will enter and submit the permit and wait for the DNR's approval. There could be some new requirements or testing with the new permit.

McMahon

We received a quote from McMahon to update the facility plan amendment to include solar for \$5,000 to \$10,000 so that it could be included in phase 1. McMahon's plan is to resubmit phase 1 in September as it stands. We will find out around January if we would receive principal forgiveness on phase 1 for 2027 which is doubtful. I believe that if we were to receive the 2.1 million principal forgiveness, we would then scramble a bit to figure out how to complete phase 1 in 2027. Once we get to January, we will hopefully have answer from the DNR about the clean water funding and have our REU system restructured and planning for the future.

Around January if we do not receive principal forgiveness, we can then decide how to combine phases 1 & 2 into a single project with a timeline for completion and whether to include solar or have it be a stand-alone project financed through other means.

We can discuss any of these at the meeting.

Thank You,

Brad

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Influent Flow and Loading

1. Monthly Average Flows and BOD Loadings

1.1 Verify the following monthly flows and BOD loadings to your facility.

Influent No. 703	Influent Monthly Average Flow, MGD	x	Influent Monthly Average BOD Concentration mg/L	x	8.34	=	Influent Monthly Average BOD Loading, lbs/day
January	0.0317	x	97	x	8.34	=	26
February	0.0273	x	100	x	8.34	=	23
March	0.0823	x	52	x	8.34	=	35
April	0.1125	x	76	x	8.34	=	71
May	0.1075	x	143	x	8.34	=	128
June	0.1404	x	214	x	8.34	=	251
July	0.1728	x	216	x	8.34	=	311
August	0.1297	x	204	x	8.34	=	221
September	0.0835	x	210	x	8.34	=	146
October	0.0723	x	314	x	8.34	=	190
November	0.0371	x	179	x	8.34	=	55
December	0.0349	x	145	x	8.34	=	42

2. Maximum Monthly Design Flow and Design BOD Loading

2.1 Verify the design flow and loading for your facility.

Design	Design Factor	x	%	=	% of Design
Max Month Design Flow, MGD	.62	x	90	=	0.558
		x	100	=	.62
Design BOD, lbs/day	2073	x	90	=	1865.7
		x	100	=	2073

2.2 Verify the number of times the flow and BOD exceeded 90% or 100% of design, points earned, and score:

	Months of Influent	Number of times flow was greater than 90% of	Number of times flow was greater than 100% of	Number of times BOD was greater than 90% of design	Number of times BOD was greater than 100% of design
January	1	0	0	0	0
February	1	0	0	0	0
March	1	0	0	0	0
April	1	0	0	0	0
May	1	0	0	0	0
June	1	0	0	0	0
July	1	0	0	0	0
August	1	0	0	0	0
September	1	0	0	0	0
October	1	0	0	0	0
November	1	0	0	0	0
December	1	0	0	0	0
Points per each		2	1	3	2
Exceedances		0	0	0	0
Points		0	0	0	0
Total Number of Points					0

0

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

3. Flow Meter

3.1 Was the influent flow meter calibrated in the last year?

- ☒ Yes Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY)

2025-04-11

☐ No

If No, please explain:

4. Sewer Use Ordinance

4.1 Did your community have a sewer use ordinance that limited or prohibited the discharge of excessive conventional pollutants ((C)BOD, SS, or pH) or toxic substances to the sewer from industries, commercial users, hauled waste, or residences?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If No, please explain:

4.2 Was it necessary to enforce the ordinance?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If Yes, please explain:

5. Septage Receiving

5.1 Did you have requests to receive septage at your facility?

Septic Tanks

Holding Tanks

Grease Traps

☒ Yes

☒ Yes

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No

☒ No

5.2 Did you receive septage at your facility? If yes, indicate volume in gallons.

Septic Tanks

☒ Yes

57,210

gallons

☐ No

Holding Tanks

☒ Yes

2,322,450

gallons

☐ No

Grease Traps

☐ Yes

gallons

☒ No

5.2.1 If yes to any of the above, please explain if plant performance is affected when receiving any of these wastes.

Did not affect performance of treatment plant

6. Pretreatment

6.1 Did your facility experience operational problems, permit violations, biosolids quality concerns, or hazardous situations in the sewer system or treatment plant that were attributable to commercial or industrial discharges in the last year?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, describe the situation and your community's response.

6.2 Did your facility accept hauled industrial wastes, landfill leachate, etc.?

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, describe the types of wastes received and any procedures or other restrictions that were in place to protect the facility from the discharge of hauled industrial wastes.	
--	--

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (BOD/CBOD)

1. Effluent (C)BOD Results

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for BOD or CBOD

Outfall No. 001	Monthly Average Limit (mg/L)	90% of Permit Limit > 10 (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average (mg/L)	Months of Discharge with a Limit	Permit Limit Exceedance	90% Permit Limit Exceedance
January	30	27	3	1	0	0
February	30	27	3	1	0	0
March	30	27	4	1	0	0
April	30	27	5	1	0	0
May	30	27	5	1	0	0
June	30	27	5	1	0	0
July	30	27	6	1	0	0
August	30	27	3	1	0	0
September	30	27	3	1	0	0
October	30	27	3	1	0	0
November	30	27	3	1	0	0
December	30	27	3	1	0	0

* Equals limit if limit is ≤ 10

Months of discharge/yr	12		
Points per each exceedance with 12 months of discharge		7	3
Exceedances		0	0
Points		0	0
Total number of points			0

NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to state waters, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge. Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is $12/6 = 2.0$

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

2. Flow Meter Calibration

2.1 Was the effluent flow meter calibrated in the last year?

- ☒ Yes Enter last calibration date (MM/DD/YYYY)

2025-04-11

☐ No

If No, please explain:

3. Treatment Problems

3.1 What problems, if any, were experienced over the last year that threatened treatment?

None

4. Other Monitoring and Limits

4.1 At any time in the past year was there an exceedance of a permit limit for any other pollutants such as chlorides, pH, residual chlorine, fecal coliform, or metals?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

If Yes, please explain: 4.2 At any time in the past year was there a failure of an effluent acute or chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) test? ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, please explain: 4.3 If the biomonitoring (WET) test did not pass, were steps taken to identify and/or reduce source(s) of toxicity? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A Please explain unless not applicable:	
--	--

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Total Suspended Solids)

1. Effluent Total Suspended Solids Results

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for TSS:

Outfall No. 001	Monthly Average Limit (mg/L)	90% of Permit Limit >10 (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average (mg/L)	Months of Discharge with a Limit	Permit Limit Exceedance	90% Permit Limit Exceedance
January	30	27	10	1	0	0
February	30	27	8	1	0	0
March	30	27	6	1	0	0
April	30	27	10	1	0	0
May	30	27	7	1	0	0
June	30	27	10	1	0	0
July	30	27	10	1	0	0
August	30	27	7	1	0	0
September	30	27	7	1	0	0
October	30	27	6	1	0	0
November	30	27	6	1	0	0
December	30	27	7	1	0	0
* Equals limit if limit is <= 10						
Months of Discharge/yr				12		
Points per each exceedance with 12 months of discharge:					7	3
Exceedances					0	0
Points					0	0
Total Number of Points						0

0

NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to state waters, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge.

Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is $12/6 = 2.0$

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Ammonia - NH3)

1. Effluent Ammonia Results

1.1 Verify the following monthly and weekly average effluent values, exceedances and points for ammonia

Outfall No. 001	Monthly Average NH3 Limit (mg/L)	Weekly Average NH3 Limit (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average NH3 (mg/L)	Monthly Permit Limit Exceed ance	Effluent Weekly Average for Week 1	Effluent Weekly Average for Week 2	Effluent Weekly Average for Week 3	Effluent Weekly Average for Week 4	Weekly Permit Limit Exceed ance
January	18	18	0	0		0			0
February	18	18	.074	0			.074		0
March	18	18	.1	0		.1			0
April	18	18	.65	0		.65			0
May	18	18	.049	0		.049			0
June	18	18	.11	0		.11			0
July	18	18	3.9	0			3.9		0
August	18	18	.099	0			.099		0
September	18	18	0	0			0		0
October	18	18	.076	0			.076		0
November	18	18	.06	0	.06				0
December	18	18	.15	0		.15			0
Points per each exceedance of Monthly average:									10
Exceedances, Monthly:									0
Points:									0
Points per each exceedance of weekly average (when there is no monthly average):									2.5
Exceedances, Weekly:									0
Points:									0
Total Number of Points									0

NOTE: Limit exceedances are considered for monthly OR weekly averages but not both. When a monthly average limit exists it will be used to determine exceedances and generate points. This will be true even if a weekly limit also exists. When a weekly average limit exists and a monthly limit does not exist, the weekly limit will be used to determine exceedances and generate points.

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Effluent Quality and Plant Performance (Phosphorus)

1. Effluent Phosphorus Results

1.1 Verify the following monthly average effluent values, exceedances, and points for Phosphorus

Outfall No. 001	Monthly Average phosphorus Limit (mg/L)	Effluent Monthly Average phosphorus (mg/L)	Months of Discharge with a Limit	Permit Limit Exceedance
January	.6	0.207	1	0
February	.6	0.127	1	0
March	.6	0.151	1	0
April	.6	0.210	1	0
May	.6	0.238	1	0
June	.6	0.483	1	0
July	.6	0.469	1	0
August	.6	0.222	1	0
September	.6	0.260	1	0
October	.6	0.266	1	0
November	.6	0.181	1	0
December	.6	0.184	1	0
Months of Discharge/yr			12	
Points per each exceedance with 12 months of discharge:				10
Exceedances				0
Total Number of Points				0

0

NOTE: For systems that discharge intermittently to waters of the state, the points per monthly exceedance for this section shall be based upon a multiplication factor of 12 months divided by the number of months of discharge.

Example: For a wastewater facility discharging only 6 months of the year, the multiplication factor is $12/6 = 2.0$

1.2 If any violations occurred, what action was taken to regain compliance?

--

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Biosolids Quality and Management

1. Biosolids Use/Disposal

1.1 How did you use or dispose of your biosolids? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Land applied under your permit
- ☐ Publicly Distributed Exceptional Quality Biosolids
- ☒ Hauled to another permitted facility
- ☐ Landfilled
- ☐ Incinerated
- ☐ Other

NOTE: If you did not remove biosolids from your system, please describe your system type such as lagoons, reed beds, recirculating sand filters, etc.

1.1.1 If you checked Other, please describe:

3. Biosolids Metals

Number of biosolids outfalls in your WPDES permit:

3.1 For each outfall tested, verify the biosolids metal quality values for your facility during the last calendar year.

Outfall No. 002 - Liquid Sludge

Parameter	80% of Limit	H.Q. Limit	Ceiling Limit	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	80% Value	High Quality	Ceiling
Arsenic		41	75											<13			0	0
Cadmium		39	85											.38			0	0
Copper		1500	4300											350			0	0
Lead		300	840											<10			0	0
Mercury		17	57											<.4			0	0
Molybdenum	60		75											3.5		0		0
Nickel	336		420											<10		0		0
Selenium	80		100											<26		0		0
Zinc		2800	7500											500			0	0

3.1.1 Number of times any of the metals exceeded the high quality limits OR 80% of the limit for molybdenum, nickel, or selenium = 0

Exceedence Points

- 0 (0 Points)
- 1-2 (10 Points)
- > 2 (15 Points)

3.1.2 If you exceeded the high quality limits, did you cumulatively track the metals loading at each land application site? (check applicable box)

- Yes
- No (10 points)
- N/A - Did not exceed limits or no HQ limit applies (0 points)
- N/A - Did not land apply biosolids until limit was met (0 points)

3.1.3 Number of times any of the metals exceeded the ceiling limits = 0

Exceedence Points

- 0 (0 Points)
- 1 (10 Points)
- > 1 (15 Points)

3.1.4 Were biosolids land applied which exceeded the ceiling limit?

- Yes (20 Points)
- No (0 Points)

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

3.1.5 If any metal limit (high quality or ceiling) was exceeded at any time, what action was taken? Has the source of the metals been identified? 	0
6. Biosolids Storage 6.1 How many days of actual, current biosolids storage capacity did your wastewater treatment facility have either on-site or off-site? ● >= 180 days (0 Points) ○ 150 - 179 days (10 Points) ○ 120 - 149 days (20 Points) ○ 90 - 119 days (30 Points) ○ < 90 days (40 Points) ○ N/A (0 Points) 6.2 If you checked N/A above, explain why. 	0
7. Issues 7.1 Describe any outstanding biosolids issues with treatment, use or overall management: 	

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Staffing and Preventative Maintenance (All Treatment Plants)

1. Plant Staffing 1.1 Was your wastewater treatment plant adequately staffed last year? ● Yes ○ No If No, please explain: Could use more help/staff for: 1.2 Did your wastewater staff have adequate time to properly operate and maintain the plant and fulfill all wastewater management tasks including recordkeeping? ● Yes ○ No If No, please explain:	
2. Preventative Maintenance 2.1 Did your plant have a documented AND implemented plan for preventative maintenance on major equipment items? ● Yes (Continue with question 2) ☐☐ ○ No (40 points)☐☐ If No, please explain, then go to question 3: 2.2 Did this preventative maintenance program depict frequency of intervals, types of lubrication, and other tasks necessary for each piece of equipment? ● Yes ○ No (10 points) 2.3 Were these preventative maintenance tasks, as well as major equipment repairs, recorded and filed so future maintenance problems can be assessed properly? ● Yes ○ Paper file system ○ Computer system ● Both paper and computer system ○ No (10 points)	0
3. O&M Manual 3.1 Does your plant have a detailed O&M and Manufacturer Equipment Manuals that can be used as a reference when needed? ● Yes ○ No	
4. Overall Maintenance /Repairs 4.1 Rate the overall maintenance of your wastewater plant. ○ Excellent ● Very good ○ Good ○ Fair ○ Poor Describe your rating: Quality of maintenance is reflected in efficient plant operations.	

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Operator Certification and Education

1. Operator-In-Charge

1.1 Did you have a designated operator-in-charge during the report year?

- ☒ Yes (0 points)
- ☐ No (20 points)

Name:

BRADLEY A RASMUSSEN

Certification No:

33543

0

2. Certification Requirements

2.1 In accordance with Chapter NR 114.56 and 114.57, Wisconsin Administrative Code, what level and subclass(es) were required for the operator-in-charge (OIC) to operate the wastewater treatment plant and what level and subclass(es) were held by the operator-in-charge?

Sub Class	SubClass Description	WWTP	OIC		
		Basic	OIT	Basic	Advanced
A1	Suspended Growth Processes	X		X	
A2	Attached Growth Processes				
A3	Recirculating Media Filters				
A4	Ponds, Lagoons and Natural				
A5	Anaerobic Treatment Of Liquid				
B	Solids Separation	X		X	
C	Biological Solids/Sludges	X		X	
P	Total Phosphorus	X		X	
N	Total Nitrogen				
D	Disinfection	X		X	
L	Laboratory	X		X	
U	Unique Treatment Systems				
SS	Sanitary Sewage Collection	X	NA	X	NA

0

2.2 Was the operator-in-charge certified at the appropriate level and subclass(es) to operate this plant? (Note: Certification in subclass SS is required 5 years after permit reissuance.)

- ☒ Yes (0 points)
- ☐ No (20 points)

2.3 For wastewater treatment facilities with a registered or certified laboratory, is at least one operator that works in the laboratory certified at the basic level in the laboratory (L) subclass?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A – Wastewater treatment facility does not have a registered or certified laboratory

2.4 For wastewater treatment facilities that own and operate a sanitary sewage collection system, has at least one operator been designated the OIC for sanitary sewage collection system and certified at the basic level in the sanitary sewage collection system (SS) subclass?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A – Owner of the Wastewater treatment facility does not own and operate a sanitary sewage collection system

3. Succession Planning

3.1 In the event of the loss of your designated operator-in-charge, did you have a contingency plan to ensure the continued proper operation and maintenance of the plant that includes one or more of the following options (check all that apply)?

- ☒ One or more additional certified operators on staff

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

☐ An arrangement with another certified operator ☒ An arrangement with another community with a certified operator ☐ An operator on staff who has an operator-in-training certificate for your plant and is expected to be certified within one year ☐ A consultant to serve as your certified operator ☐ None of the above (20 points) If "None of the above" is selected, please explain:	0
4. Continuing Education Credits 4.1 If you had a designated operator-in-charge, was the operator-in-charge earning Continuing Education Credits at the following rates? OIT and Basic Certification: ☒ Averaging 6 or more CECs per year. ☐ Averaging less than 6 CECs per year. Advanced Certification: ☐ Averaging 8 or more CECs per year. ☐ Averaging less than 8 CECs per year.	

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

Financial Management

1. Provider of Financial Information

Name:

Bradley A. Rasmusson

Telephone:

9204210123

(XXX) XXX-XXXX

E-Mail Address
(optional):

brasmusson@ephraim.wi.gov

2. Treatment Works Operating Revenues

2.1 Are User Charges or other revenues sufficient to cover O&M expenses for your wastewater treatment plant AND/OR collection system ?

● Yes (0 points) ☐

○ No (40 points)

If No, please explain:

2.2 When was the User Charge System or other revenue source(s) last reviewed and/or revised?
Year:

2025

● 0-2 years ago (0 points) ☐

○ 3 or more years ago (20 points) ☐

○ N/A (private facility)

2.3 Did you have a special account (e.g., CWWP required segregated Replacement Fund, etc.) or financial resources available for repairing or replacing equipment for your wastewater treatment plant and/or collection system?

● Yes (0 points)

○ No (40 points)

0

REPLACEMENT FUNDS [PUBLIC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SHALL COMPLETE QUESTION 3]

3. Equipment Replacement Funds

3.1 When was the Equipment Replacement Fund last reviewed and/or revised?

Year:

2025

● 1-2 years ago (0 points) ☐

○ 3 or more years ago (20 points) ☐

○ N/A

If N/A, please explain:

3.2 Equipment Replacement Fund Activity

3.2.1 Ending Balance Reported on Last Year's CMAR

\$ 502,696.00

3.2.2 Adjustments - if necessary (e.g. earned interest, audit correction, withdrawal of excess funds, increase making up previous shortfall, etc.)

\$ 0.00

3.2.3 Adjusted January 1st Beginning Balance

\$ 502,696.00

3.2.4 Additions to Fund (e.g. portion of User Fee, earned interest, etc.)

+

\$ 101,266.48

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

3.2.5 Subtractions from Fund (e.g., equipment replacement, major repairs - use description box 3.2.6.1 below*)

- \$ 10,700.48

3.2.6 Ending Balance as of December 31st for CMAR Reporting Year

\$ 593,262.00

All Sources: This ending balance should include all Equipment Replacement Funds whether held in a bank account(s), certificate(s) of deposit, etc.

3.2.6.1 Indicate adjustments, equipment purchases, and/or major repairs from 3.2.5 above.

Replacement of generator exhaust fan motor, New collection sampler head, grinder pump, replaced plant overhead door opener

3.3 What amount should be in your Replacement Fund? \$ 265,500.00

Please note: If you had a CWFPP loan, this amount was originally based on the Financial Assistance Agreement (FAA) and should be regularly updated as needed. Further calculation instructions and an example can be found by clicking the SectionInstructions link under Info header in the left-side menu.

3.3.1 Is the December 31 Ending Balance in your Replacement Fund above, (#3.2.6) equal to, or greater than the amount that should be in it (#3.3)?

● Yes

○ No

If No, please explain.

4. Future Planning

4.1 During the next ten years, will you be involved in formal planning for upgrading, rehabilitating, or new construction of your treatment facility or collection system?

● Yes - If Yes, please provide major project information, if not already listed below. ☐ ☐

○ No

Project #	Project Description	Estimated Cost	Approximate Construction Year
1	Phase 1 Treatment Plant and Collection System upgrades and repairs with McMahon. General upgrades to Lift Station #1 and replacement of Lift Station #2. Improvements to "preliminary treatment" including influent pump station, hauled-in waste receiving, influent screening, and grit removal. Improvements to "secondary treatment" including equipment and piping associated with the aeration basins, clarifiers, and chemical storage and feed systems. Improvements to UV disinfection and effluent pumping. Pump, piping and valve replacement to improve solids handling. Electrical, controls, and SCADA system upgrades. General improvements to existing treatment building and site.	\$8,000,000	2026
2	Phase 2 Replacement of blowers, modifications to aeration piping, adding mixers to basins, replace clarifier drive, chemical storage and feed system improvements, add effluent orthophosphate analyzer, replace effluent pumps, improvements to UV system, replacement of sludge transfer pumps and piping, improve sludge decant pumps and piping, general improvements to treatment building and grounds.	\$2,700,000	2027

5. Financial Management General Comments

The Village has decided to hold off on the phase approach for the improvements and revisit this in a single phase. We are currently working on restructuring the REU assignments and will adjust the rates accordingly.

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND USE

6. Collection System

6.1 Energy Usage

6.1.1 Enter the monthly energy usage from the different energy sources:

COLLECTION SYSTEM PUMPAGE: Total Power Consumed

Number of Municipally Owned Pump/Lift Stations:

	Electricity Consumed (kWh)	Natural Gas Consumed (therms)
January	3,793	
February	3,173	
March	3,597	
April	5,586	
May	5,542	
June	5,332	
July	6,541	
August	6,332	
September	5,297	
October	3,621	
November	2,975	
December	3,435	
Total	55,224	0
Average	4,602	0

6.1.2 Comments:

Electrical usage lift 1 & 2

6.2 Energy Related Processes and Equipment

6.2.1 Indicate equipment and practices utilized at your pump/lift stations (Check all that apply):

- ☐ Comminution or Screening
- ☐ Extended Shaft Pumps
- ☒ Flow Metering and Recording
- ☐ Pneumatic Pumping
- ☒ SCADA System
- ☐ Self-Priming Pumps
- ☒ Submersible Pumps
- ☒ Variable Speed Drives
- ☐ Other:

6.2.2 Comments:

6.3 Has an Energy Study been performed for your pump/lift stations?

☐ No

☒ Yes

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Year:

2018

By Whom:

McMahon / Focus on Energy

Describe and Comment:

An energy study was conducted on the efficient use of KWs used to operate lift stations.

6.4 Future Energy Related Equipment

6.4.1 What energy efficient equipment or practices do you have planned for the future for your pump/lift stations?

When the Village moves forward with the upgrades safety and efficiency is at the top of the list.

7. Treatment Facility

7.1 Energy Usage

7.1.1 Enter the monthly energy usage from the different energy sources:

TREATMENT PLANT: Total Power Consumed/Month

	Electricity Consumed (kWh)	Total Influent Flow (MG)	Electricity Consumed/ Flow (kWh/MG)	Total Influent BOD (1000 lbs)	Electricity Consumed/ Total Influent BOD (kWh/1000lbs)	Natural Gas Consumed (therms)
January	25,227	0.98	25,742	0.81	31,144	
February	25,990	0.76	34,197	0.64	40,609	
March	26,678	2.55	10,462	1.09	24,475	
April	22,640	3.38	6,698	2.13	10,629	
May	20,293	3.33	6,094	3.97	5,112	
June	25,497	4.21	6,056	7.53	3,386	
July	34,432	5.36	6,424	9.64	3,572	
August	35,666	4.02	8,872	6.85	5,207	
September	36,611	2.51	14,586	4.38	8,359	
October	33,428	2.24	14,923	5.89	5,675	
November	30,474	1.11	27,454	1.65	18,469	
December	29,542	1.08	27,354	1.30	22,725	
Total	346,478	31.53		45.88		0
Average	28,873	2.63	15,739	3.82	14,947	0

7.1.2 Comments:

7.2 Energy Related Processes and Equipment

7.2.1 Indicate equipment and practices utilized at your treatment facility (Check all that apply):

- ☒ Aerobic Digestion
- ☐ Anaerobic Digestion
- ☐ Biological Phosphorus Removal
- ☐ Coarse Bubble Diffusers
- ☒ Dissolved O2 Monitoring and Aeration Control
- ☒ Effluent Pumping

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 2025

- ☒ Fine Bubble Diffusers
- ☒ Influent Pumping
- ☐ Mechanical Sludge Processing
- ☐ Nitrification
- ☒ SCADA System
- ☒ UV Disinfection
- ☒ Variable Speed Drives
- ☐ Other:

7.2.2 Comments:

7.3 Future Energy Related Equipment

7.3.1 What energy efficient equipment or practices do you have planned for the future for your treatment facility?

When we do the upgrades to the facility electrical efficiency is a goal.

8. Biogas Generation

8.1 Do you generate/produce biogas at your facility?

● No

○ Yes

If Yes, how is the biogas used (Check all that apply):

- ☐ Flared Off
- ☐ Building Heat
- ☐ Process Heat
- ☐ Generate Electricity
- ☐ Other:

9. Energy Efficiency Study

9.1 Has an Energy Study been performed for your treatment facility?

○ No

● Yes

☒ Entire facility

Year:

2018

By Whom:

McMahon / Focus on Energy

Describe and Comment:

An energy study was conducted on the efficient use of KWs used to operate the plant.

☐ Part of the facility

Year:

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

By Whom:		
Describe and Comment:		

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 2025

Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems

1. Capacity, Management, Operation, and Maintenance (CMOM) Program

1.1 Do you have a CMOM program that is being implemented?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

If No, explain:

1.2 Do you have a CMOM program that contains all the applicable components and items according to Wisc. Adm Code NR 210.23 (4)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No (30 points)
- ☐ N/A

If No or N/A, explain:

1.3 Does your CMOM program contain the following components and items? (check the components and items that apply)

☒ Goals [NR 210.23 (4)(a)]

Describe the major goals you had for your collection system last year:

Collection system being properly operated, and maintained. Meet the general standards listed in the WPDES permit.

Did you accomplish them?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

If No, explain:

☒ Organization [NR 210.23 (4) (b)] ☐ ☐

Does this chapter of your CMOM include:

- ☒ Organizational structure and positions (eg. organizational chart and position descriptions)
- ☒ Internal and external lines of communication responsibilities
- ☒ Person(s) responsible for reporting overflow events to the department and the public

☒ Legal Authority [NR 210.23 (4) (c)]

What is the legally binding document that regulates the use of your sewer system?

Chap 13 NU Ordinance

If you have a Sewer Use Ordinance or other similar document, when was it last reviewed and revised? (MM/DD/YYYY) 2025-06-10

Does your sewer use ordinance or other legally binding document address the following:

- ☒ Private property inflow and infiltration
- ☒ New sewer and building sewer design, construction, installation, testing and inspection
- ☒ Rehabilitated sewer and lift station installation, testing and inspection
- ☐ Sewage flows satellite system and large private users are monitored and controlled, as necessary
- ☒ Fat, oil and grease control
- ☒ Enforcement procedures for sewer use non-compliance

☒ Operation and Maintenance [NR 210.23 (4) (d)]

Does your operation and maintenance program and equipment include the following:

- ☐ Equipment and replacement part inventories
- ☒ Up-to-date sewer system map

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

☒ A management system (computer database and/or file system) for collection system information for O&M activities, investigation and rehabilitation

☒ A description of routine operation and maintenance activities (see question 2 below)

☐ Capacity assessment program

☐ Basement back assessment and correction

☒ Regular O&M training

☒ Design and Performance Provisions [NR 210.23 (4) (e)] ☐ ☐

What standards and procedures are established for the design, construction, and inspection of the sewer collection system, including building sewers and interceptor sewers on private property?

☒ State Plumbing Code, DNR NR 110 Standards and/or local Municipal Code Requirements

☒ Construction, Inspection, and Testing

☐ Others:

0

☒ Overflow Emergency Response Plan [NR 210.23 (4) (f)] ☐ ☐

Does your emergency response capability include:

☒ Responsible personnel communication procedures

☒ Response order, timing and clean-up

☒ Public notification protocols

☒ Training

☒ Emergency operation protocols and implementation procedures

☒ Annual Self-Auditing of your CMOM Program [NR 210.23 (5)] ☐ ☐

☒ Special Studies Last Year (check only those that apply):

☐ Infiltration/Inflow (I/I) Analysis

☐ Sewer System Evaluation Survey (SSES)

☐ Sewer Evaluation and Capacity Management Plan (SECAP)

☐ Lift Station Evaluation Report

☒ Others:

Needs assessment and facility plan amendment has been completed by McMahon Engineering.

2. Operation and Maintenance

2.1 Did your sanitary sewer collection system maintenance program include the following maintenance activities? Complete all that apply and indicate the amount maintained.

Cleaning % of system/year

Root removal % of system/year

Flow monitoring % of system/year

Smoke testing % of system/year

Sewer line televising % of system/year

Manhole inspections % of system/year

Lift station O&M # per L.S./year

Manhole rehabilitation % of manholes rehabbed

Mainline rehabilitation % of sewer lines rehabbed

Private sewer inspections % of system/year

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:

5/14/2026

2025

Private sewer I/I removal % of private services

River or water crossings % of pipe crossings evaluated or maintained

Please include additional comments about your sanitary sewer collection system below:

3. Performance Indicators

3.1 Provide the following collection system and flow information for the past year.

28.22	Total actual amount of precipitation last year in inches
30.83	Annual average precipitation (for your location)
11.2	Miles of sanitary sewer
4	Number of lift stations
0	Number of lift station failures
0	Number of sewer pipe failures
0	Number of basement backup occurrences
0	Number of complaints
0.0799	Average daily flow in MGD (if available)
0.2582	Peak monthly flow in MGD (if available)
	Peak hourly flow in MGD (if available)

3.2 Performance ratios for the past year:

0.00	Lift station failures (failures/year)
0.00	Sewer pipe failures (pipe failures/sewer mile/yr)
0.00	Sanitary sewer overflows (number/sewer mile/yr)
0.00	Basement backups (number/sewer mile)
0.00	Complaints (number/sewer mile)
3.2	Peaking factor ratio (Peak Monthly:Annual Daily Avg)
0.0	Peaking factor ratio (Peak Hourly:Annual Daily Avg)

4. Overflows

LIST OF SANITARY SEWER (SSO) AND TREATMENT FACILITY (TFO) OVERFLOWS REPORTED **

Date	Location	Cause	Estimated Volume
------	----------	-------	------------------

None reported

** If there were any SSOs or TFOs that are not listed above, please contact the DNR and stop work on this section until corrected.

5. Infiltration / Inflow (I/I)

5.1 Was infiltration/inflow (I/I) significant in your community last year?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If Yes, please describe:

5.2 Has infiltration/inflow and resultant high flows affected performance or created problems in your collection system, lift stations, or treatment plant at any time in the past year?

☐ Yes

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

● No If Yes, please describe: 5.3 Explain any infiltration/inflow (I/I) changes this year from previous years: We found a sump pump that was connected to the sanitary sewer mistakenly by the property owner. It was addressed right away and reconnected to the storm sewer drain on the property. 5.4 What is being done to address infiltration/inflow in your collection system? continued manhole inspections and line televising with repairs being made as they arise.	
---	--

Total Points Generated	0
Score (100 - Total Points Generated)	100
Section Grade	A

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

Grading Summary

WPDES No: 0061271

SECTIONS	LETTER GRADE	GRADE POINTS	WEIGHTING FACTORS	SECTION POINTS
Influent	A	4	3	12
BOD/CBOD	A	4	10	40
TSS	A	4	5	20
Ammonia	A	4	5	20
Phosphorus	A	4	3	12
Biosolids	A	4	5	20
Staffing/PM	A	4	1	4
OpCert	A	4	1	4
Financial	A	4	1	4
Collection	A	4	3	12
TOTALS			37	148
GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) = 4.00				

- Notes:
- A = Voluntary Range (Response Optional)
 - B = Voluntary Range (Response Optional)
 - C = Recommendation Range (Response Required)
 - D = Action Range (Response Required)
 - F = Action Range (Response Required)

Compliance Maintenance Annual Report

Ephraim Wastewater Treatment Facility

Last Updated: Reporting For:
5/14/2026 **2025**

Resolution or Owner's Statement

Name of Governing Body or Owner:	Village of Ephraim
Date of Resolution or Action Taken:	2026-06-01
Resolution Number:	02-2026
Date of Submittal:	

ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO SPECIFIC CMAR SECTIONS (Optional for grade A or B. Required for grade C, D, or F):
Influent Flow and Loadings: Grade = A

Effluent Quality: BOD: Grade = A

Effluent Quality: TSS: Grade = A

Effluent Quality: Ammonia: Grade = A

Effluent Quality: Phosphorus: Grade = A

Biosolids Quality and Management: Grade = A

Staffing: Grade = A

Operator Certification: Grade = A

Financial Management: Grade = A

Collection Systems: Grade = A
(Regardless of grade, response required for Collection Systems if SSOs were reported)

ACTIONS SET FORTH BY THE GOVERNING BODY OR OWNER RELATING TO THE OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE AND ANY GENERAL COMMENTS
(Optional for G.P.A. greater than or equal to 3.00, required for G.P.A. less than 3.00)
G.P.A. = 4.00

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM
RESOLUTION 02-2026
WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

WHEREAS, it is a requirement under a Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) permit issued by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to file a Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR) for its (Wastewater Treatment/Wastewater Collection System) under the Wisconsin Administrative Code NR 208; **WHEREAS**, it is necessary to acknowledge that the governing body has reviewed the Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR);

WHEREAS, it is necessary to provide recommendations or an action response plan for all individual CMAR section grades (of “C” or less) and/or an overall grade point average (< 3.00);

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED by the Wastewater Committee of the Village of Ephraim that the following recommendations or actions will be taken to address or correct problems/ deficiencies of the wastewater treatment or collection system as identified in the Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR). The Wastewater Treatment/Wastewater Collection System received a 4.0 overall grade point average (Grade A) with no corrections or deficiencies at the time of the regular meeting of the Wastewater Committee.

Adopted by the Wastewater Committee at its regular meeting on the 1st day of June 2026

VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM
COUNTY OF DOOR, WISCONSIN

By: _____
Karen McMurtry, Village of Ephraim
Wastewater Committee Chair

Attest: _____
Brent Bristol, Village of Ephraim Administrator